The development of the Teachers' Standards in England and Professional Standards for Teachers in Scotland: determining the pedagogic discourse and recontextualising principle

Coughlin, Dominic James

Awarding institution:
King's College London

The development of the Teachers' Standards in England and Professional Standards for Teachers in Scotland: determining the pedagogic discourse and recontextualising principle

Mr. Dominic James Coughlin

Student number: 0848370

School of Education, Communication and Society

King's College, London

Doctorate in Education

December 2016

Abstract

Teaching standards have increasingly been used to identify and categorise the work of teachers across educational systems for the purpose of certification and licencing, as performance indicators and, in some cases, to map out professional development. Accordingly, in both England and Scotland, teaching standards have been a central tenet in attempts to regulate the work of teachers. Most recently in England this has resulted in the *Teachers' Standards* (DfE, 2012b), and in Scotland the *Professional Standards for Teachers* comprising of *The Standards for Registration* (GTCS, 2012h), *The Standard for Career-Long Professional Learning* (GTCS, 2012f), and *The Standards for Leadership and Management* (GTCS, 2012g).

This research provides a comparative analysis of the recontextualising principle and pedagogic discourse (Bernstein, 2000), the rules and regulations, which led to the production of these most recent sets of standards in England and Scotland. A mixed qualitative approach was taken to the research questions composing documentary analysis and interviews with those involved with the reviews. The analysis of text drew on Basil Bernstein's Pedagogic Device (Bernstein, 2000) combined with Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) (Fairclough, 2003) to provide a single theoretical lens. CDA was 'put to work' (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999, p.2) within the Pedagogic Device to tease out the discursive practices of the reviews of teaching standards through the examinations of the documentary and interview data.

The *Professional Standards for Teachers* in Scotland look to Hoyle's (1974) 'extended professionality' and Sachs' 'activism' (2003a) as the model for teacher professionalism, whereas the *Teachers' Standards* in England, developed in the controlled environment of the Department of Education (DfE), represent a more passive teacher at the restricted end of Hoyle's continuum. In regards to the development of teaching standards, the DfE approaches the review process as a 'classic bureaucracy' (Dimmock, 2007) in tightly regulating the drafting of the *Teachers' Standards.* The General Teaching Council for Scotland adopts two identities to the development of the *Professional Standards for Teachers*. First, it integrates, through an interlocking committee structure, with the Scottish Government and their associated institutions. Second, it adopts an 'informal' organisational approach to writing the standards.

Word count: 52,466

Table of contents

Table of tables

Glossary of abbreviations and terms

ARK	Absolute Return for Kids. An academy chain of schools in England.
CDA	Critical Discourse Analysis is a linguistic analytical metod used in this thesis to analysie text.
CPD	Continuing professional development.
Donaldson Review	The report of the review of teacher education in Scotland led by Professor Graham Donaldson and published in December 2010.
DfE	From 2010 The Department for Education has been the Government department with responsibility for education in England (the Department for Children, Schools and Families was its predecessor from 2007 to 2010).
DfES	Department for Education and Skills was the Government department in England responsible for schools from 2001 to 2007.
EIS	The Educational Institute of Scotland is a teacher trade union and professional association in Scotland with over 59,000 members (in 2016).
GCSE	General Certificate of Secondary Education is the national qualification taken by sixteen year olds in England.
GTC England	Created in 2000 and disbanded in 2012, the General Teaching Council for England had a regulatory role for teachers in England.
GTC Scotland	General Teaching Council for Scotland is the fully independent regulatory professional body for teachers in Scotland.
Genre (CDA)	Fairclough (2003) identifies genres as ways of acting discoursally (e.g. in an interview) which can be moved from one location to another (disembedding) as part of a genre chain. Sometimes there are more than one genre in a single text (genre mixing).
ITE	Initial Teacher Education: this term is generally used by university departments of education (as opposed to ITT) representing teaching as a complex activity.
ITT	Initial Teacher Training ITT, this term is used by, amongst others, the Government in England, and indicates that teaching is an occupation best developed through an extended period of training, predominately in schools.
NASBTT	The National Association of School-Based Teacher Trainers in England.

NUT	National Union of Teachers is a trade union and professional association representing teachers in England and Wales.
Ofsted	The Office for Standards in Education is the schools' regulator in England.
ORF	Official Recontextualising Field, a sub field of Bernstein's (2000) recontextualising field occupied by the state and their associated institutions.
OECD	Organisation for Economic and Co-operation and Development (OECD).
PISA	Programme for International Student Assessment, an international comparison of pupil attainment organised by the OECD.
PRF	Pedagogic Recontextualising Field, a sub field of Bernstein's (2000) recontextualising field usually occupied by institutions not under state control.
Pedagogic Device	A theoretical framework, consisting of rules and fields, that brings together discourses to form pedagogic discourse.
Pedagogic discourse	Discourse developed within the Pedagogic Device composed of regulatory and instructional discourse.
QAAHE	Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education in Scotland, an organisation that was involved in developing early revisions of the Professional Standards for Teachers in Scotland.
QTS	Qualified Teacher Status is the state certification of teachers in England.
Social practices (CDA)	Social practices define particular ways of acting, representing and being. For example, it could be a social practice associated with the professionalising of teaching. They can have a regulatory function over the production of text and are there linked to the concept of recontextualisation.
Teachers' Standards (TS)	Published in September 2012, the Teachers' Standards form the current set of national teaching standards in England. Shortened to 'TS' in this thesis.
TDA	Training and Development Agency for Schools; formed from the Teacher Training Agency with a wider remit for training across schools (2005 to 2012).
TTA	Teacher Training Agency: established in 1994, this Government agency had responsibility for the recruitment, training and supply of teachers in England.
UCET	The Universities' Council for the Education of Teachers, representing university departments of education in the UK.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge and thank the people who have assisted in the writing of this thesis.

First, I would like to thank my Lead Supervisor, Dr. Anwar Tlili, and Second Supervisor, Professor Christopher Winch, for their guidance, challenge and critical engagement.

Second, I would like to thank my father, Dr. Sean Coughlin, and my friend and colleague, Mr. John M. McGee, for proofreading this thesis and for making helpful suggestions.

Third, I wish to thank the people who agreed to take time out from their busy lives to be interviewed as part of the research.

Finally, I wish to thank my wife, Mrs. Victoria Coughlin, for her support and forbearance during the extended period of data collection for the research and writing of this thesis.

This research has been aided by grants from the School of Social Sciences and Public Policy Postgraduate Research Fund at King's College and from the Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain Small Grants Fund.

This is for Victoria Coughlin, Lizzie Elliott, Jenny Elliott, Katy Elliott, Ned Elliott, Stella Coughlin and Iona Coughlin.

Chapter 1: Introducing teaching standards as the model for teacher professionalism

1.1 The 'good teacher' and the advance of teaching standards

The notion of good teaching, or what it is to be a 'good teacher', is a highly contested terrain. Conceptions of the 'good teacher' include the ethical practitioner, the classroom craftsman, the performing teacher and the research-engaged teacher. Whilst these notions of the teacher are unlikely to operate in isolation, it is important to conceptualise them in a clear and adequate manner as they are often used to inform policy decisions and codify teachers' professional knowledge.

Recently, the advance of globalisation and the economic realignment of education have been accompanied with a new managerialist mode of regulating the work of teachers. This version of the 'good teacher' is one where the teacher is driven by the academic attainment of their pupils – the 'economy of performance' (Stronach et al., 2002) – responsive to government policy initiatives, setting aside professional values to embrace new managerialism techniques and technologies (S. Robertson, 1996, p.45). This notion of good teaching has been a dominant discourse of many governments in the English-speaking world. Whilst some teachers have embraced this discourse in fashioning themselves as entrepreneurial teachers, others have maintained personal beliefs and ethics as the centre-point of their practice.

One way in which governments, and their allied institutions and agencies, have tried to influence the professional culture of teaching is through competency approaches, once more familiar to vocational education and training (Lum, 1999). Competency statements have been used as part of an audit approach to the work of teachers (Power, 1997), reducing teacher attributes to a series of behavioural characteristic descriptors. Furthermore, as Bernstein (1996) pointed out, the competency discourse can deflect the focus of educational failure away from analysis and reform of social conditions and towards blame of individual schools and teachers, however, Whitty suggested that a competency approach could 'be rather more flexible and adaptable than at first sight appears' (Whitty, 1992, p.42). He stressed that any attempt at defining competencies for teaching should acknowledge the broader professional role of a teacher in addition to specific classroom skills. More recently, competency statements have been replaced by more broader teaching standards with their '*prescriptions* of attitudes, values and practices' (Winch, 2012, p.316, italics original).

Thus, at present not only are the actions of a 'good teacher' pre-determined, but so are the values underpinning them.

The use of teaching standards around the English-speaking world has changed the landscape for teacher certification, accountability and regulation. Standards, which usually take the form of a series of declarative statements, have become the controversial vanguard of systemic reform of teaching and teachers. From their origins in the United States of America, they have been seen by some as identifying 'what teachers should know and be able to do' (Branscomb, 1986) and by others as reductive (Furlong, 2005; Martin & Cloke, 2000) and infused with the language of government officialdom (Beck, 2009). Connell identifies teaching standards as an 'organizational requirement' framed through a language that is heavily influenced by 'corporate managerialism' which ignores the emotional work of teachers (Connell, 2009, p.219), while Mahony and Hextall (2000, p.31) see them as 'designed to enhance the ability of government to steer policy from the centre'.

Alongside the contention over the need for teaching standards at all, there is a parallel struggle for the discourse and text of standards themselves. This battle is part of a wider struggle for the soul of teaching and to define what it is to be a 'good teacher'. Crucial to controlling the text of teaching standards are the regulation and orchestration of the drafting process and the framing of the discourse surrounding their development. This thesis sets out to consider this process of standards development with a specific focus on the development of the *Teachers' Standards* (DfE, 2012b) in England and the *Professional Standards for Teachers* (GTCS, 2012f; g; h) in Scotland.

1.2 The research questions

This research aims to go beyond simply looking at the outputs from the most recent reviews of teaching standards in England and Scotland in order to focus on the reviews themselves. More specifically this involves a focus on, what Bernstein (2000) refers to as, the 'recontextualising principle' and 'pedagogic discourse' of the reviews of teaching standards through the textual representation of these events.

To introduce the concept of pedagogic discourse, Bernstein refers to it as not actually a discourse in itself but as a series of rules and principles that are brought together to determine the forms of knowledge, in this case, presented in the teaching standards. Those institutions and individuals who regulate the pedagogic discourse do so as 'a relay for ideological messages' (Bernstein, 2000, p.25). The pedagogic discourse then determines the outputs in the form of the text of the teaching standards. The focus for this research is the activity in the review and writing groups of the teaching standards, what Bernstein would refer to as the recontextualising field. It is the recontextualising

principle that regulates the recontextualising field and determines which discourse are brought together to form pedagogic discourse.

In seeking to identify the nature of the pedagogic discourse it is important to understand the events leading up to the development of the teaching standards in England and Scotland. This starts with the announcements of the reviews and the policy and political scene-setting, followed by identifying the agents of the reviews and the rules under which they were regulated. Finally, in order fully to determine the pedagogic discourse, an examination is required of the teaching standards themselves, together with the associated documents.

1.2.1 First

How was the case made for replacing the existing teaching standards in England and Scotland?

This important question seeks to draw on some of the wider debates and arguments presented by the respective governments in England and Scotland, and their associated agencies, in presenting the case for the need to review the existing teaching standards, including whether there was consent amongst teachers for the reviews to take place. This question links to the overall aim for the research in setting the scene for the development of pedagogic discourse.

1.2.2 Second

Which policy actors occupied the recontextualising field of the reviews, how were they selected and what identities did they bring to the review process?

This question seeks to establish the identities (Fairclough, 2003), or 'ideological screens' (Bernstein, 2000, p.115), of such actors who have privileged access to the review and drafting groups. Such groups, and those excluded from the groups, constitute the recontextualising field. Crucially, Bernstein stressed the importance of ideology in the development of pedagogic discourse.

1.2.3 Third

Within the Pedagogic Device of the Scottish and English reviews of teaching standards, what was the nature of the recontextualising rules?

Bernstein (2000) identifies a recontextualising principle as regulating the recontextualising field and helping to shape the emerging pedagogic discourse. This consists of rules and principles that regulate the work of individuals and institutions occupying the recontextualising field. Thus, this question seeks to determine the rules and principles under which the reviews of teaching standards were carried out.

1.2.4 Fourth

What is the official knowledge basis for teachers informing the *Teachers' Standards* in England and *Professional Standards for Teachers* in Scotland?

Given the breadth of debate over teachers' professional knowledge within the literature, the research was concerned with how different types of knowledge were prioritised and which were pushed into the background during the review processes; and by extension, which accounts were included in and excluded from the text of the teaching standards themselves. In analysing the text of the teaching standards and related documents, this research question seeks to build on the findings from the previous research questions to clarify the nature of the pedagogic discourse.

1.3 The significance of this research

This research is concerned with the process of teacher standards development in the context of the *Teachers' Standards* in England (DfE, 2012b) and the *Professional Standards for Teachers* in Scotland (2012f; g; h). The research aims to establish the rules and regulations governing the reviews and the forms of discourse brought together to determine the text of the teaching standards. The theoretical frameworks provided by Bernstein (2000), in the form of his Pedagogic Device, and Fairclough's (2003) Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) allowed insight into the reviews in England and Scotland. They helped to make sense of the documentary and interview research data.

In order fully to contextualise the reviews, both the case made for the reviews and the ideological orientations of those involved are identified before considering the rules and principles under which the reviews were conducted. The theoretical lens provided through the combination of the Pedagogic Device and CDA provides an approach to both textual analysis and interpretation. The research develops a unique approach to combining Bernstein's theoretical framework and Fairclough's analytical approaches and tools to analyse the nature of the review process through their textual representation.

The findings have the potential to make a significant contribution towards this insufficiently researched area. They go beyond merely looking at the merits and the meaning of teaching standards to address ideological issues realted to their development. In an age of professional transformation for teachers, the findings should inform the development of future suites of teaching standards both across these two nations and beyond. In England, this includes the potential for the development of standards through the embryonic Royal College of Teachers and, in Scotland, through

the now fully independent General Teaching Council for Scotland. At this point it is important to make clear that the research presupposes the value and validity of self-regulation for teachers and the merits of this as a professional goal (Sachs, 2003a; Whitty, 2000). This is the perspective from which the research is viewed. While it supports the development of teaching standards, the research is from a perspective which advocates a transparent process involving the active engagement of serving teachers.

1.4 The case for a comparative study

The increasingly diverse English and Scottish educational contexts form the basis for this case-orientated (Ragin, 1987, p.16) comparative study. Considering the close administrative and cultural commonalities between the two nations for over 200 years, the two education systems are markedly distinct (Menter et al., 2006) with different approaches to school administration and teacher development. Raffe et al. (1999) are strong advocates of home international educational comparisons due to 'a common language, cultural affinities, a common administrative environment and geographical proximity' (p. 22). Hence, this research seeks to use these common features to map out the similarities and differences associated with the teaching standards development processes. Other similar policy comparisons between England and Scotland (Hulme & Menter, 2011; Kennedy, 2016; Menter et al., 2004) have been from a Scottish perspective. The researcher in this case is familiar with the English context and less familiar the Scottish context. It is important to note that Scotland has far fewer teachers than England[1]. This, in itself, should not significantly alter the nature of the comparative study as teaching standards are not dependent on the size of the teacher population.

This research seeks to examine the rules and principles under which the most recent versions of teaching standards were developed in England and Scotland. Although this is an under researched area, Hulme and Menter (2011) provide a textual comparison of two key documents which form a major part of this study – *Teaching Scotland's Future* (Donaldson, 2011) and *The Importance of Teaching* (DfE, 2010b). Although the two documents had differing purposes in the policy process, strong themes emanating from both documents are the importance of teachers' subject knowledge and the need for leadership development for schools. However, there are subtle differences in how conceptions of teacher professionalism are framed and presented. As Hulme and Menter point out, English approaches to policy review have been characterised by 'indicative of 'apparent' rather than 'substantive' forms of dialogue, including

[1] There were 51,078 full-time equivalent teachers in Scotland in September 2013 (OECD 2015) and about 450,00 teachers in publically funded schools in England.

circumscribing membership of key groups (notably the Teachers' Standards Review)' (p.98, speak marks and brackets are original). In contrast, in their view the Professional Standards for Teachers in Scotland have been 'owned by the profession; generated and reviewed by the GTCS' (p. 86). This forms the background for this research and the basis for a comparative study.

1.5 Chapter introductions

The thesis follows a traditional format in so far as methodology and analysis chapters follow a review of literature and focus on the theoretical and analytical concepts. The analysis chapters (chapters 5 to 8) each review the English and Scottish contexts separately before engaging in a comparative analysis. There is significant crossover between the different analysis chapters and they touch on similar themes as they build the overall arguments.

So far and for the remainder of this thesis, for reasons of consistency, the term teaching standards will be used. However, in addressing maters of nomenclature, Sachs (2005) argues that *teacher* standards are concerned with measuring teacher output and performance; whereas, *teaching* standards point to the teacher as a developing professional. It is for this reason that the term *teaching standards* is used in thesis and presupposes a position for the research that identifies the teacher as a developing professional.

1.5.1 Chapter 2: Establishing the context through the literature

Although this area is under-researched and cannot draw directly on a wealth of literature related to the processes of developing teaching standards, this chapter aims to establish the wider context around teachers' professional knowledge and teaching standards. There is a particular focus on the historic development of teaching standards in England and Scotland.

1.5.2 Chapter 3: Theoretical and analytical approach

While Bernstein's (2000) Pedagogic Device provides the theoretical framework for the research, the analytical framework is provided by Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) (Fairclough, 2003). Chouliaraki & Fairclough (1999, p.2) refer to CDA being 'put to work' within the framework provided by the Pedagogic Device. Hence, the final part of this chapter will consider how the two frameworks are combined.

1.5.3 Chapter 4: Methodology

The methodology chapter introduces and justifies the use of the two principle methodological tools: analysis of key documents related to the reviews of teaching

standards and interviews with those involved in the standards development process. The chapter goes on to identify how the frameworks provided by the Pedagogic Device and CDA translate into analytical tools.

1.5.4 Chapter 5: Making a case for change: the arguments for the reviews of teaching standards

The analysis starts by drawing on Toulmin's (1988) analysis of argumentation to assess the cases made for the reviews of teaching standards in England and Scotland. This requires considering how global influences on education are translated into the national policy making context and the strategies used to legitimise the reviews.

1.5.5 Chapter 6: Creating the recontextualising fields of the reviews of teaching standards

This chapter builds on the arguments developed in chapter 5 through moving the analysis form the national to the local. This involves identifying the recontextualising rules used to appoint members to the review groups that occupy the recontextualising field. In seeking to identify the emerging pedagogic discourse from the reviews, the 'ideological screens' (Bernstein, 2000) of the review groups members are considered.

1.5.6 Chapter 7: Regulating the recontextualising fields of the reviews of teaching standards

Bernstein (2000) refers to a recontextualising principle regulating the recontextualising field. In applying this to the reviews of teaching standards, the procedures set for and by the Review in England and Writing Groups in Scotland are identified to reveal the regulatory processes in operation.

1.5.7 Chapter 8: The official knowledge base: bringing teachers' professional knowledge into order

This chapter is concerned with the text of the teaching standards themselves and the associated discourse of the reviews of teaching standards in England and Scotland. The principle analytical tool used for this chapter was CDA including a consideration of intertextuality and a subsequent mapping of the underlying assumptions and ideological positioning regarding teachers' professional knowledge.

1.5.8 Chapter 9: Conclusion

The final chapter brings together the four analysis chapters to provide a summary of the findings and present the concluding arguments. New knowledge is identified and the implications for future development of teaching standards are considered.

Chapter 2: Establishing the context through the literature

2.1 Introduction

This research is concerned with the development of the most recent set of teaching standards in England (DfE, 2012b) and Scotland (2012f; g; h). Section 1.1 has introduced the concept of the 'good teacher' and how it relates to the development of teaching standards. This literature review aims to locate the nature of teaching standards development against a background debate about the changing nature of teachers' professional knowledge and professionalism.

The review of literature is divided into two distinct areas. First, the chapter charts the nature of teachers' professional knowledge and its relationship to teachers' occupational identity. Given that this area is well researched, it was important to set tight parameters for the selection of literature for this section of the review. Hence, only literature that directly relates to the English and Scottish contexts is discussed. The second focus for this review of literature is to consider the development of teaching standards generally and then, more specifically, in England and Scotland.

Before embarking on the literature review, it is important to develop a working definition for teaching standards. In attempting to define the term *standard* in the context of teaching (Kleinhenz & Ingvarson, 2007; Sykes & Plastrik, 1993), an understanding of the root and generic meanings of 'standard' could be a useful starting point; first, it can mean a rallying call or ensign, perhaps in a military context, and second, it can refer to a form of measurement or some attempt at regulation. In applying these definitions to teaching standards, there are both the notions of desiring a united teaching profession around a certain set of values or propositions alongside the desire for achieving uniformity or consistency of performance. It is from such a definition, in addition to their appeal to common sense and uncritical nature (Sachs 2005), that teaching standards hold an elusive appeal to governments.

2.2 The changing nature of the 'good teacher'

Both in England and Scotland the concept of change is used as justification for large-scale interventions in the day-to-day work of teachers, including the need to implement and review teaching standards. These interventions have had profound implications for teachers' professional knowledge and their occupational identity and standing. This section starts by identifying some normative conceptions of the 'good teacher' before addressing the nature of 'change' in teachers' work and one of its main drivers,

globalisation. It ends with an overview of how the concepts of the 'good teacher' have been reconciled with the reductive tendencies of teaching standards.

2.2.1 Paradigms of teachers' professional knowledge and identity

A traditional view (Larson, 1977) of professions is that their prestige can largely be secured through the nature and status of their professional knowledge and institutions, which in turn determines their public standing, autonomy and levels of remuneration. Such esoteric knowledge is mainly empirically derived, used for technical application and requires lengthy periods of acquisition. This orthodoxy sees a hierarchy of professions within society with the elite professions, such as medicine or law, achieving occupational closure (K. MacDonald, 1985; Winch, 2004). A criticism of elite professions is that they have self-defined their status through monopolising certain areas of knowledge (Breslin, 2002) and by protecting self-interests (Martimianakis et al., 2009). This ability to out-manoeuvre and avoid interventions from the state has been seen as a hallmark of full professional status.

Some occupational groups, such as teachers and nurses, have sought to emulate the elite professions and achieve full professional status; they have however struggled to identify a clear epistemology of practice, being more traditionally associated with the well-being and care of members of society. As a result, Etzioni (1969) characterised teachers, social workers and nurses as the semi-professions. In a similar vein, Glazer (1974) referred to them as the minor professions due to their limited autonomy, weaker forms of specialist knowledge and shorter periods of initial preparation. Consequently, there is a widely held belief amongst policymakers in England (Freedman et al., 2008; Gove, 2011; O'Hear, 1988) that it is not essential for teachers to undertake a period of educational theoretical engagement or research training in preparation for day-to-day classroom activities. Rather, teachers develop through the mastery of classroom craft, the acquisition of tacit knowledge (Polanyi, 1958; 1967) and development of an affective character (Carr, 2007).

An influential review of literature commissioned by the Scottish Government, *Literature Review on Teacher Education in the 21st Century* (Menter et al., 2010), identified four 'paradigms' for teacher professionalism: the *effective* teacher, the *reflective* teacher, the *enquiring* teacher and the *transformative* teacher. The four paradigms are broadly located between Eric Hoyle's (1974) restricted professionality (the effective teacher), characterised by performance skills, introspective approach to teaching methods and limited professional collaboration, and extended professionality (the transformative teacher), characterised by engagement in educational theory and research, professional learning communities and acknowledgement of wider societal issues.

Added to this are two other teacher professionalism paradigms which this research will also consider: the *craft knowledge* teacher and the *virtuous* teacher.

To help make sense of the breath of literature in this area, each of these paradigm cases will now be briefly discussed separately with particular reference to the English and Scottish contexts. Although the paradigms should not be viewed in isolation as there is considerable overlap between them, in each case, it is assumed that teachers have *something* to teach in the form of subject matter knowledge (Grossman, 1990, p.6).

The craft knowledge teacher

Classroom craft, combined with subject matter knowledge, has been a version of teachers' professional knowledge favoured by governments (Gove, 2010; TDA, 2008), academics (O'Hear, 1988), head-teachers (Marland, 1993), and think tanks (Cox et al., 1989; Freedman, Lipson et al., 2008). A closer look, however, reveals a dichotomy of meanings attributed to the concept of 'craft knowledge'.

The theoretical origins of 'craft' derive from the Greek term *techne* which Joseph Dunne identifies as the 'kind of knowledge possessed by an expert in one of the specialized crafts' (Dunne, 1993, p.224). Grimmett and MacKinnon suggest that craft knowledge 'represents the construction of situated, learner-focused, procedural and content-related pedagogic knowledge' (Grimmett & MacKinnon, 1992, p.393). Polanyi coined the phrase 'connoisseurship' as something that 'can be communicated only by example, not by precept' (Polanyi, 1958, p.54). While few woud argue with these definitions, the real contention is over the relative ease of its acquisition and sufficiency as the sole knowledge required of teachers.

More recently in England the promotion of craft knowledge has seen the demotion of empirically or philosophically derived forms of knowing, leading to the marginalisation of university-based forms of teacher education. In England craft elements of teaching have been seen as best developed through 'observing a master craftsman or woman ... and being rigorously observed' (Gove, 2010). It is believed that this development of 'know-how' (Ryle, 1949) happens with relative ease, and enables teachers to quickly secure certification within the context of practice. The strong appeal to notions of craft knowledge in England have been overtaken by a stronger desire for time-restricted and school-based forms of teacher preparation.

In Scotland, however, the development of craft knowledge, although viewed as essential for good teaching, in itself has been seen as insufficient for the preparation of teachers (Donaldson, 2011; Kirk, 2011). This alternative conception of craft requires

careful development with a more experienced exponent and necessitates being suplimented by academic study and reflection.

In an attempt to make sense of craft knowledge, this thesis utilises Polanyi's notion of connoisseurship which highlights the tacit dimension of craft knowledge – knowledge that is not propositional but known only to the individual.

> Wherever connoisseurship is found operating within science or technology we may assume that it persists only because it has not been possible to replace it by measureable grading. For a measurement has the advantage of greater objectivity, as shown by the fact that measurements give consistent results in the hands of different observers all over the world, while such objectivity is rarely achieved in the case of physiognomic appreciations. The large amount of time spent by students of chemistry, biology and medicine in their practical courses shows how greatly these sciences rely on the transmission of skills and connoisseurship from master to apprentice.
>
> (Polanyi, 1958, p.55)

Here Polanyi is making the distinction between propostional knowledge, for example, knowledge that might be recorded in a renowned textbook within a particular field of knowledge, and knowledge that can only be communicated through releationships with more experienced practitioners. Implicit in Polanyi's writing, by making reference to chemisty, biology and medicine fields of knowledge, is that connoisseurship is a lengthy and possibly career-long process. Hence in this thesis, connoisseurship is identified as something that requires lengthy periods of development and considerable dialogue between master and apprentice. It does therefore require extensive periods of time to achieve full acquisition.

The virtuous teacher

Central to any review of teaching standards is the consideration of how the moral purpose of the 'good teacher' is woven into the fabric of the text. The 'practical wisdom' or *phronêsis* account of teaching, first put forward by Aristotle and favoured by David Carr, is linked to the concepts of authority and discipline, teachers' affective character, concern for the individual child and involving 'reasoning from moral values to moral prescription' (Carr, 2003, p.81). Dunne identifies *phronêsis* as a form of personal knowledge acquired and deployed in 'one's actions with one's fellows' (Dunne, 1993, p.224). It is through acquisition of 'a form of personal knowledge' that teachers possess certain virtues that enable them to make moral judgements and develop practical wisdom and moral literacy (I. Lunt, 2008). Reflection on such experiences contribute towards the development of this disposition (Dunne, 1993, p.367) and through engaging with such moral dilemmas it is thought that teachers can develop their own

rationality of practice. Richard Smith's (2005) discussion on the subject provides us with a description of practical judgement where a teacher selects teaching practices that fall within the ethical norms of the profession and uses these as a basis for ethical practice.

For those developing teaching standards, there is the dilemma of locating the virtuous teacher within the text of the standards. Whether to identify the virtuous teacher in affirmative terms, or to identify a list of dos and don'ts, is fundamental to the overall discourse of the text. Typically, this has been approached through developing separate codes of conduct, usually by the respective teaching council in each national policymaking context.

In England, before the disbanding of the General Teaching Council for England in 2012, the *Code of Conduct and Practice for Registered Teachers* (GTCE, 2009) identified the seven principles of 'selflessness, integrity, honesty, objectivity, accountability, openness and leadership' (Cooke, 2013, p.5), laid down in the Nolan Committee report (Nolan, 1995), as the virtues required of teachers. In Scotland, the *Code of Professionalism and Conduct* (GTCS, 2012a) is aligned with the *UN Convention on the Rights of the Child* (UNICEF, 2009). These had formed the official basis for the concept and norm of the *virtuous teacher* before the replacement of the GTC England's Code of Conduct by the *Teachers' Standards* (DfE, 2012b). Connell (2009) proposes that teacher registration bodies might be the institutions where good teaching could be defined in ways that depart from the competency models. This potentially would give greater voice to the *virtuous teacher*.

The effective teacher

Menter, Hulme et al. (2010, p.21) characterise this form of teacher as dominating much of official government discourse in the developed world over the last three decades. The desire for the rapid preparation of teachers in many countries has prioritised competency-based education and training (Lum, 1999) together with a performance culture (Mahony & Hextall, 2000), aligned with a nationally prescribed curriculum, over other forms of teacher preparation. The concept of good teaching within this paradigm is entwined with notions of efficiency and reductiontionism – that there are a series of undisputed and identifiable underlying truths to effective teacher behaviours in the classroom.

This teacher is associated with top-down accountability and 'performance management' regimes (Evans, 2011) with Stephen Ball associating it with the 'terrors of performativity' (Ball, 2003). Such a technical rational approach to teachers' professional knowledge has been advanced alongside market-based reforms in

education and an ‘economy of performance’ (Stronach, Corbin et al., 2002) where teacher effectiveness is measured through pupil attainment grades and school inspection results. The development of such practice is via a form of reflection in the moment of teaching of ‘refection-in-action’ (Schön, 1983; 1987) that does not require academic study to develop (Freedman, 2008).

The reflective teacher

Many teacher education programmes have looked instead to notions of teacher reflection or ‘reflective practice’ or ‘reflection-on-action’ as a means of addressing practical problems faced by teachers. This concept of reflection has become a defining feature of pre-service preparation for teachers and has been influenced by Donald Schön’s account of professional education in his books *The Reflective Practitioner* (Schön, 1983) and *Educating the Reflective Practitioner* (Schön, 1987). The concept of reflective practice has been the objective of many teacher education programmes characterised by dialogue with more experienced practitioners, discussions with peers and reflection after the teaching episodes have taken place. However, it has been accused of being ill defined (Hatton & Smith, 1995) and ‘sloganistic’ (McLaughlin, 1999), aimed at opposing governmental interventions. There have been calls to look beyond this model of professional preparation in favour of a more critical engagement for teachers (Bradbury et al., 2010).

The enquiring teacher

As an enquiring teacher, the teacher is characterised as being an enquiring and research-engaged practitioner. This has been a model particularly favoured in Scotland (Fox, 2009; Robinson, 2010), characterised by such programmes as the Chartered Teacher Programme (Scottish Executive, 2002), where teachers have been encouraged to engage in practitioner research, sometimes referred to as ‘action research’ (Baumfield, 2012). However, this in itself is not without difficulty as, due to teachers’ ‘historical lack of research training they have tended to accept theories deriving from research uncritically’ (Barrow & Foreman-Peck, 2005, p.35). In addition, where there are identifiable difficulties in generating empirical knowledge for teachers, there appears not to be agreement on how outstanding issues can be resolved (Strike, 2007, p.178). For this reason, doubts about the worth of educational research have often seen its findings ignored or marginalised (Stewart, 2010) and, as a result, teachers have fallen short of having an agreed epistemology on which to ground practice. Shulman call for a form of ‘pedagogic content knowledge’ (1987) in so far as it combines both the ‘what’ of teaching (subject matter knowledge) with the ‘how’ of teaching (pedagogic knowledge). Such practical forms of knowing includes knowledge

of common misconceptions within a specific subject area, an understanding of the most appropriate teaching strategies for a class, and knowledge of how to structure and present content.

The transformative teacher

Judyth Sachs has written widely about a range of topics associated with teacher professionalism and more specifically teaching standards (Sachs, 2001; 2003b; 2005). Through writing predominantly from a teacher perspective, her *activist* form of professionalism (Groundwater-Smith & Sachs, 2002; Sachs, 2001) presents a progressive model for teacher professional representation. She advocates an identity for teachers which accepts an open flow of ideas and adopts a reflectively critical stance towards policies and initiatives as part of an 'informed professional voice' (Williamson & Robinson, 2009). This mode of teacher professionalism is very much associated with Hoyle's (1974) extended professionality, characterised by engagement in learning communities and incorporating elements of the reflective and enquiring teachers. Through using Hoyle's characterisation of professionality, Menter, Brisard et al. (2006) identified England as more *restricted*; whereas, Scotland was more *extended* with strong intellectual components, explicit statements on values and focus on teacher education.

2.2.2 Globalisation and the work of teachers

The ever-closer economic, social and cultural connections between nations as a result of globalisation have had a significant effect on the development of education policy. This has involved steering many governments towards implementing market-orientated reforms of teachers and teaching – the *effective teacher* model – aligned with the promotion of an efficiency and accountability culture within schools driven by managerialist approaches to school administration (Zajda, 2015). Dimmock warns that 'insidious dangers of globalisation' (Dimmock, 2007, p.286) have intensified the performance elements of teaching (Ball, 2003) in order directly to align teaching with pupil attainment and economic goals. Connell points to how neo-liberal ideology gives centre stage to 'managerial voices' (Connell, 2009, p.226) with the deep-rooted vulnerability of the teaching profession (Beck, 2008, p.121), in many Anglophone countries, leading to repeated large-scale interventions by governments into the work of teachers, including the imposition of teaching standards.

Global institutions such as the Organisation for Economic and Co-operation Development (OECD) and the World Trade Organisation (WTO), through their policies, have had a strong influence on the dissemination of knowledge and on how individual nations organise their education 'systems' and educational institutions (Zajda, 2015).

Justification for many policy interventions within nations have been linked to international comparative data including the PISA rankings produced by the OECD. Such 'soft governance' has seen the OECD become increasingly influential in the education policy field (Knodel et al., 2014). This has led to policy 'borrowing' (Phillips, 2015) or 'travelling' (Ozga & Jones, 2006) on the way towards an educational policy hegemony where different nations have similar education policies.

Another example of 'soft governance' has come from the management consultancy firm McKinsey & Company. Their widely acknowledged blueprint for school reform in the globalised world – The McKinsey Report: *How the world's best performing schools come out on top* (Barber & Mourshed, 2007) – highlights three 'guiding principles' for 'achieving real improvement in outcomes' (p. 40). The first of these principles is well known and much quoted: 'the quality of an education system cannot exceed the quality of its teachers,'[2] a statement that has been attributed to a South Korean Minster for Education. As Chris Husband points out however, the focus for this quote is on the 'teacher' as opposed to 'teaching' (Husbands, 2013) with the emphasis being on the people (teachers) not the activity (teaching). Hence, if the desire were to improve pupil learning, then the answer would appear to be to remove the most ineffective teachers and replace them with more effective ones. As Husband goes on to argue, this approach is both impractical, as the sheer size of the teacher population in England means that change could take decades, and illogical as the same teacher could teach lessons of variable quality from very good lessons to poor lessons. Less widely quoted are the second and third of McKinsey's guiding principles: 'the only way to improve outcomes is to improve instruction' and 'achieving universally high outcomes is only possible by putting in place mechanisms to ensure that schools deliver high-quality instruction to every child' (Barber & Mourshed, 2007, p.40). It is the last principle that is of interest to this research in so far as it advocates 'putting in place mechanisms' including, perhaps, teaching standards.

2.2.3 Towards a performance conception for the 'good teacher'

While globalisation has been used as justification for large-scale policy interventions in education, the work of teachers has essentially been viewed within a performance orientation. Ball refers to 'three interrelated *policy technologies*; the market, managerialism and performativity' (Ball, 2003, p.215, italics original), when referring to reforms to the work of teachers. This has led to low-trust relationships between teachers and the state, and the encroachments on the nature of teachers' professional

[2] So influential was this quote that it appears in the first sentence of Dame Sally Coates' forward to the Report on the Independent Review of Teachers' Standards (DfE 2011e).

knowledge with the prioritisation of competency and performance approaches. Where Ball uses the phrase 'performativity' (ibid), Stronach, Corbin et al. (2002) uses the term 'economy of performance' to characterise this form of approach. In England, this has been interpreted as new professionalism (Beck, 2009; Storey, 2007) and has been embraced by professionizers (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2001; Furlong, 2002) and successive governments in England. This has been enacted through such legislation as *Teachers: meeting the challenge of change* (DfEE, 1998) where the importance of school leadership, or leaderism (O'Reilly & Reed, 2010; 2011), has been elevated. In Scotland, where a more tempered approach to globalisation has been adopted (Doherty & McMahon, 2007), there has been a social partnership orientation towards policy formation; for example, in the policy formation following from the McCrone Report: *A teaching profession for the twenty first century* (McCrone, 2000) and via the now fully independent General Teaching Council for Scotland. However, central to policy making in both countries has been the development of teaching standards.

2.2.4 From the 'good teacher' to teaching standards

The contested notion of the 'good teacher' means that there is no agreement on what constitutes teachers' professional knowledge. As discussed, the idea of the *effective teacher*, together with simplified concepts of the *craft knowledge teacher,* has been prominent in the globalised world requiring the acquisition of a limited copus of affective behaviours. Unfortunately, this has often seen elements of the *virtuous teacher* sidelined with little room for teachers to reflect on and develop practical wisdom. Although a contested notion in itself, the *reflective teacher,* sometimes alined with the *enquiring teacher*, has been seen as a panacea to the performance discourse associated with the *effective teacher* due to its flexible nature and percieved compatability with other paradigms. While no teacher restricts themselves to one particular paradigm, in England there has been national policy movement towards the *effective teacher* model, Hoyle's (1974) restricted professionality, and in Scotland towards the *reflective* and *enquiring teacher,* Hoyle's extended professionality. Both nations draw on craft knowledge, although the interpretation of this is quite different.

Given the range of 'good teacher' paradigms discussed, the task of codifying teachers' professional knowledge and locating the teacher within the text of teaching standards is problematic and highly contested. In aiming to capture particular identities for teachers within teaching standards, certain knowledge forms are prioritised while other are pushed into the background. What often comes to the fore, however, is a mixture of overlapping, and often competing, teacher paradigms. For example, in previous attempts at developing standards in England, there has been a tendency to conflate

the *craft knowledge teacher* with the *effective teacher*. This has led to compromises in both the modes of development and length of pre-service preparation as part of a performance model at the restricted end of Hoyle's (1974) continuum. In contrast in Scotland, there have been calls for the enquiring and transformative teacher (Donaldson, 2011) as a way of unlocking children's potential.

In thinking about how these different teacher paradigms translate into teaching standards, Judith Sachs presents us with the regulatory and developmental standards. She identifies a tension between the two: 'on the one hand, developmental standards give promise to a revitalised and dynamic teaching profession; on the other hand, regulatory standards regimes can remove professional autonomy, engagement and expertise away from teachers' (Sachs, 2005, p.3). Regulatory standards can be associated with teacher 'performance' measured by the attainment of pupils. Kleinhenz and Ingvarson point to the assumption of linking teacher 'quality' with pupil attainment as if they are inherently connected (Kleinhenz & Ingvarson, 2007, p.12). The developmental approach can be characterised by a career-long view of teaching and teacher development and the belief in professional learning communities.

2.3 The development of teaching standards in England and Scotland

This section charts the progress of the development of teaching standards in England and Scotland, which may be broadly plotted on a continuum from exacting regulatory standards through to more dialogical and developmental standards.

2.3.1 England (1997-2012): responding to Government agendas

To date, there have been four versions of teaching standards released in England: in 1997, 2002, 2007 and 2012. Prior to 1997, the Government in England and Wales had only broadly prescribed the content of teacher training in the form of generalised teacher competencies introduced in 1992. Government Circular 10/97 (DfEE, 1997) transformed these competencies into exacting standards for the award of Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) which became a requirement for all schoolteachers in England. Although initially conceived by the then Conservative Government, New Labour carried them through with very little change (Furlong, 2005). Consultation on the standards, carried out by the newly formed Teacher Training Agency (TTA)[3], started in February 1997, with the release of the TTA's consultation paper *Requirements for All Courses of*

[3] The TTA was set up by the Conservative Government in 1995 to oversee the supply of teachers and funding of ITT. In 2005 it was given a wider remit for training and development across the whole school workforce and changed its name to the Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA).

Initial Teacher Training (TTA, 1997b) and, very quickly, they were published in July 1997 (TTA, 1997a).

Mahony and Hextall's (2000, p. 36-39) detailed analysis of the development of the 1997 set of standards revealed a high degree of sensitivity associated with both the formation of the standards working groups and the consultation processes. Survey questionnaires distributed, as part of their research, to the 55 members of the four *National Standards Working Groups* produced a very low number of responses. Subsequent follow-up telephone enquiries revealed that the TTA had 'clarified' to group members by letter that the Working Group process was a confidential one and that the research was 'wholly independent of the TTA' (Mahony & Hextall, 2000, p.36). This appeared to put group members in a difficult position and the researchers withdrew from the field. However, Mahony and Hextall questioned the need for secrecy given the public interest in these matters. Additionally, they suggested that the outcomes from the sector consultation were not reflected in the final texts of the standards.

Two subsequent reviews of the standards produced *The Standards Framework* (DfES, 2002) and the *Professional Standards for Teachers* (TDA, 2007). The 2002 standards attempted to incorporate elements of professional values within the standards statements; however, as Ruth Heilbronn pointed out 'wherever the 2002 QTS framework attempted to account for the essentially relational nature of teaching, it hit the buffers of clarity and warrant' (Heilbronn, 2008, p.29).

By 2007 the QTS standards had been revised and extended to cover teachers at differing career stages: the *Professional Standards for Teachers* (TDA, 2007). The TTA, by now with an enhanced remit as the Teaching and Development Agency for Schools (TDA), saw the need for revision of the standards to reflect further changes in Government policy. In addition to standards for the award of QTS, there were *Core* Standards for those teachers in their first six years of teaching, *Post-Threshold* standards for those teachers applying to go onto the Upper Pay Spine, and standards for those teachers aspiring to the rank of *Advanced Skills Teacher* or *Excellent Teacher* Status.

Of importance to this research is the process of teaching standard development. To this end, Nunn (2008) offers a unique 'traveller's tale' insight into the development of the 2007 standards. As a key participant in the process, she provides an extensive reflective account of the struggle to control the standards discourse within the TDA. The process consisted of a series of project, working and writing groups, in addition to the TDA board, which considered both the structure and content of the standards. In contrast to the development of previous sets of standards, the constitution of the writing

groups appeared to be more inclusive; notably, this comprised members of the social partners of teaching unions and associations, and extensive liaising with the higher education sector.

Beck (2009), using Bernstein's concept of recontextualisation to analyse the 2007 standards, highlights the performance element of the QTS standards in suggesting that teacher education is a matter of acquiring a limited amount of state-prescribed knowledge accompanied by a set of similarly prescribed skills and competencies. He suggests that it is quite apparent to see that the standards represent the political agenda of the day and suppressed other alternatives. In fact, one of the main reasons for the revision of the standards in 2007 was the need to incorporate the educational policy initiatives released by the New Labour Government. Heilbronn, in contrast, suggested that the new standards 'had abandoned the attempt to conceptualise teaching as a fundamentally complex endeavour and [were] a result of political and economic demands on the education system' (Heilbronn, 2008, p.38).

The *Teachers' Standards* (DfE, 2012b) in England, which are the particular focus for this research, came into being on 1st September 2012, replacing the existing *Professional Standards for Teachers* (TDA, 2007) and the General Teaching Council for England's *Code of Conduct and Practice for Registered Teachers* (GTCE, 2009). The *Teachers' Standards* consist of eight standards statements in Part 1 entitled 'Teaching' and a statement relating to 'Personal and Professional Conduct' in Part 2.

After the *Teachers' Standards* had been published a second phase of the Review developed *The Master Teacher Standard* (DfE, 2011f). This standard was seemingly unique in its structure and style as a more extensive descriptive narrative of the knowledge, classroom performance, outcomes, environment and ethos, and professional context of the teacher. This extended narrative contrasted with the *Teachers' Standards* which were vastly reduced in size and scale. It was never taken forward by the DfE and was never formally published[4], with the *Teachers' Standards* left as the single reference document.

2.3.2 Scotland (2000-2012): long-term incremental change

Prior to the 2012 revision of the *Professional Standards for Teachers in Scotland* there were four active sets of standards, each developed through separate review events and covering the full scope of a teacher's career. The first standard was for benchmarked

[4] Subsequent to The Master Teacher Standard, the DfE formed in 2015 a *Teachers' Professional Development Expert Group* (DfE 2015) tasked with the development of the Standard for teachers' professional development (DfE 2016) in England which were published in July 2016.

entry into teaching: *The Standard for Initial Teacher Education* (SITE) (GTCS, 2006a). This has been updated from the original 2000 version (QAAHE, 2000) which was developed by all major stakeholders in Scotland (Christie & Kirkwood, 2006), including the General Teaching Council for Scotland (herein referred to as the GTC Scotland), under the umbrella of the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education in Scotland (QAAHE). This standard specified the expectations of student teachers at the end of their initial training year before passing on to *The Standard for Full Registration* (GTCS, 2006b).

The Standard for Chartered Teacher (Scottish Executive, 2002), for more experienced teachers seeking accreditation, was developed by an extended process involving an international review of literature, focus-group interviews with teachers, in-depth interviews with identified accomplished teachers, and a national consultation exercise (Christie & Kirkwood, 2006). It was published by the Scottish Executive in 2002 which allowed participants to attain a Master's degree in addition to *Chartered Teacher Status* (Menter, Mahony et al., 2004, p.199).

Despite the passing of a number of Scottish parliamentary electoral cycles, Scottish education has been on a largely consistent path of long-term change involving stakeholder engagement and wide consultation, including the embedding of *Curriculum for Excellence* (Scottish Executive, 2004). Underpinning the curriculum and other policy initiatives is the concept of providing 21st Century 'skills and attributes' to Scotland's children (Education Scotland, 2016). On the back of this, the Scottish Government, then formally known as the Scottish Executive, commissioned the OECD to review the national education policies of Scotland (OECD, 2011) and invited Graham Donaldson, a former Senior Chief Inspector of schools in Scotland, to carry out a review of teacher education. *Teaching Scotland's Future, report of a review of teacher education in Scotland* (Donaldson, 2011) attempted to take forward a coherent vision and apply it to teacher education. This review was considered a 'highly consultative process' (Menter & Hulme, 2011, p.390) with strong evidence-based intentions. Key themes from the report included the need for a career-long professional development structure for teachers including a new standard for 'active registration' (Donaldson, 2011, p.97) linked to a system of professional reaccreditation subsequently called *Professional Update*[5] (GTCS, 2014b).

[5] Professional Update is a national reaccreditation system for teachers in Scotland which seeks to promote self-reflection and engagement in Professional Learning. Since August 2014 engagement with Professional Update has been a requirement for registration with the GTC Scotland.

On 2nd April 2012, the GTC Scotland was granted independence[6] by the Scottish Government. With full independence, the responsibility for carrying forward the recommendation form the Donaldson Review to develop a suite of teaching standards. The redrafted *Professional Standards for Teachers in Scotland* were approved at a meeting of the GTC Scotland on 5th December 2012 and came into effect on the 1st August 2013. This suite of standards covers three areas: *The Standards for Registration* (incorporating Provisional and Full Registration) (GTCS, 2012h); *The Standard for Career-Long Professional Learning* (GTCS, 2012f); and *The Standards for Leadership and Management* (incorporating Middle Leadership and Headship) (GTCS, 2012g). Within these standards there are three identified key themes: professional values and personal commitment, Learning for Sustainability, and leadership. Aileen Kennedy (2016, p.154) notes that these three publications are not accompanied by a discussion of the writing process or stakeholder involvement which provides the starting point for this research.

[6] This was approved by the Scottish Parliament on 17th March 2011. At a similar time, the General Teaching Council in England was being disbanded.

Chapter 3: Theoretical and analytical approach

3.1 Introduction

This research combines the concepts of the Pedagogic Device (Bernstein, 1990; 1996; 2000) with Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999; Fairclough, 2000; 2001; 2003; 2005) to provide a theoretical lens to analyse documents associated with and accounts of the teaching standards reviews in England and Scotland and to help order the thinking about the review processes. The Pedagogic Device provides a means of thinking about knowledge transformation, regulation and distribution within institutions. Although much theorising of the Device is in relation to classroom interactions, there are examples of its wider application to policy contexts (Bertram, 2012; Tan, 2010) including the development of teaching standards (Beck, 2009; O'Meara & MacDonald, 2004). However, it is because of its lack of direct application to the study of text that CDA, a method of sociolinguistic analysis, is used for the detailed analysis. A form of CDA will be deployed to identify discursive practices through their textual representations. These two concepts will not run side-by-side but be hierarchically structured with the Pedagogic Device providing the over-arching principles and CDA the tools for more fine-grained analysis. Before taking a more detailed look at these two organising concepts, it is important first to introduce the central figures behind them.

Although mostly associated with sociolinguistics and the theory of language codes, Basil Bernstein (1924 – 2000) came to prominence in the 1960s and 70s as part of the new sociology of education's response to scientific methodology in researching education and addressing inequality (I. Robertson, 2008). Known for his charisma and sharp dress sense, it is his structuring of the sociology of knowledge that is of interest to this research. To this end, Bernstein's Pedagogic Device (Bernstein, 1990; 1996; 2000) provides a highly appropriate and structured framework for the analysis of the development of teaching standards in England and Scotland. The context-free and flexible nature of the Device lends itself well to exploring the central organising concepts of the teaching standards in the two nations. Despite the difficulty of applying the Pedagogic Device to empirical studies (Dowling, 2007), it has been used to examine the 2007 English *Professional Standards for Teachers* (Beck, 2009), how the Australian teaching standards were translated into teaching education programmes (O'Meara & MacDonald, 2004) and in the analysis of educational policy enactment (Singh et al., 2013).

The second central figure in the research is Norman Fairclough (b.1941). Fairclough is Emeritus Professor of Linguistics at Lancaster University and is one of the founders and most prominent proponents of CDA. Specifically, he has been concerned with how power is reflected through the ordering of language, text and discourse.

An important element of this research is the way in which the Pedagogic Device is combined with CDA to provide a coherent analytical approach that will identify the inner workings of the reviews of teaching standards. Lilie Chouliaraki (1998; Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999) has been at the forefront of combining these two concepts which have been effectively deployed in empirical studies on multicultural education in South Korea (Kang, 2014) and in the analysis of public policy in the United States of America (Woodside-Jiron, 2011). Before describing how the two concepts will be combined, there will first be a description of the Pedagogic Device followed by an identification of the elements of CDA which relate to this research.

3.2 The Pedagogic Device

The Pedagogic Device is a conceptual tool consisting of, what Bernstein refers to as, relatively stable internal rules or 'grammar' – grammar here is used in a metaphorical sense rather than a literary sense – which regulate the internal communications allowing for the conversion and manipulation of knowledge into pedagogic discourse (Bernstein, 1990, p.180). At this point it may be helpful to introduce Bernstein's notion of pedagogic discourse as 'a principle which removes (dislocates) a discourse from its substantive practice and context, and relocates that discourse according to its own principle of selective reordering and focusing' (Bernstein, 1990, p.184, brackets original).

He identifies three internal hierarchical rules for the Device – distributive rules, recontextualising rules and evaluative rules – which provide the mechanisms for shaping pedagogic discourse.

Distributive rules set out the limits of what he refers to as, esoteric and mundane knowledge, in addition to setting the conditions for the distribution of knowledge within the Device. Such distributive rules play out within tightly controlled fields of knowledge production, such as universities. *Recontextualising rules* allow for the relocation and translation of knowledge into pedagogic discourse as it travels through, in this case, the discussions, meetings and committees of the reviews of teaching standards. *Evaluative rules* identify clear pedagogies for practice. The rules can be conceived as an exoskeleton of 'ordering and disordering principles' (Singh, 2002, p.573) designed to develop pedagogic discourse through the prioritisation of certain forms of knowledge

over others. Individuals and institutions seeking to control pedagogic discourse do so in identifiable fields.

Lamnias (2002), in expanding on the writings of Bernstein, discusses two functional limitations of the Pedagogic Device. First, the internal institutions and agents of the Pedagogic Device may undermine the ideological intentions of the state through 'alternative orders'. Invariably the construction of a set of teaching standards does involve a process of discussion, consultation and drafting. Of particular interest for this research, will be whether individuals who have privileged access to these processes will 'intervene and undermine the functional intentions of the state' (ibid, p.32). This leads to the second identified limitation: in attempting to control the Pedagogic Device an arena of challenge and opposition between different interest groups and agents is created. For the purpose of this research, this is not necessarily viewed as a limitation but as an area of interest worthy of further investigation.

3.2.1 Recontextualising principle

Within the structure of the Pedagogic Device, it is apparent that the process of ordering and reordering of knowledge is increasingly been carried out by recontextualising agents and institutions away from the sites of knowledge production.

> This has implications for 'what' knowledge is available to be converted into pedagogic communication, 'who' (social division of agencies and agents) will undertake the work of pedagogising knowledge, and 'how' this knowledge is transformed into pedagogic form (Singh, 2002, p.575, speechmarks and brackets original).

Bernstein (2000, p.115) points out that a 'recontextualising principle' acts to select and regulate the work of experts engaged in the process of relocating knowledge within the Device. The removal of discourse from the sites of production becomes recontextualised by a series of rules which transform the knowledge on its journey to becoming pedagogic discourse. One such rule is the creation of recontextualising fields occupied by agents who themselves recontextualise discourse.

> The recontextualising principle creates recontextualising fields, it creates agents with recontextualising functions. The recontextualising functions then become the means whereby a specific pedagogic discourse is created. Formally, we move from a recontextualising principle to a recontextualising field with agents with practising ideologies (Bernstein, 2000, p.33).

The recontextualising field is created by a recontextualising principle as it selects agents to occupy it and regulates the activities within the field. Such agents bring with

them ideological positions which 'screen' (ibid, p.115) discourse on its way to becoming pedagogic discourse.

3.2.2 Recontextualising field

In a similar way to the rules of the Device, three hierarchical and interrelated fields can be identified; the field of production, the field of recontextualisation and the field of reproduction. These fields constitute arenas where there is struggle for control of the pedagogic discourse. Within the field of production, typically occupied by research institutions, new specialist knowledge is created ready to be pedagogised within the recontextualising field before moving onto the field of reproduction. Singh (2002, p.575) identifies specialist expert knowledge as being 'encoded in highly complex symbolic forms' necessitating significant amounts of decoding, or pedagogising, to be 'accessible to outside the specialist domains'. Such pedagogising takes place in the recontextualising field via government agencies and other interest groups. For the purpose of this research, the recontextualising field comprises the arenas associated with the reviews into teaching standards in England and Scotland – the drafting and writing groups of the reviews and their associated institutions.

Those institutions and individuals operating within the recontextualising field compete to control the pedagogic discourse and related dissemination of texts and practices.

> Activity in this field consisted of appropriating discourses from the field of production and transforming them into pedagogic discourse. This process of recontextualising entails principles of *de-location*, that is, selective appropriation of a discourse or part of a discourse from the field of production, and a principle of *re-location* of that discourse as a discourse within the recontextualising field. In this process of de- and re-location the original discourse underwent an ideological transformation according to the play of specialised interests among the various positions in the recontextualising field. (Bernstein, 2000, pages 113 - 114, italics original).

In the codification of teachers' professional knowledge in the form of teaching standards, the de-location principle relates to selecting and prioritising knowledge and ideologies, and then re-locating them amongst the drafting and writing groups of the reviews.

Within the field, a distinction is made between what is referred to as, the official recontextualising field (ORF) and the pedagogic recontextualising field (PRF). Those institutions and agents operating within the PRF do so with a level of relative autonomy associated with such institutions as university departments of education, teaching associations and other institutions independent of the state (Bernstein, 1990, p.192). In

contrast the state-controlled ORF, including its selected agencies and agents, is where official knowledge is constructed and disseminated. The state may however wish to weaken the relative autonomy of educational institutions through the elevation of the ORF and the marginalisation of the PRF.

Two way in which the state may weaken the PRF are through Bernstein's concepts of 'classification' and 'framing' (Bernstein, 2000, p.5). Strong classification is associated with fixed boundaries between areas of knowledge or categories. 'Classification, then, is basically a way of understanding how institutional regulation manages to include, exclude, accommodate and legitimize the entities which make up the institutional context of pedagogy' (Chouliaraki, 1998, p.14). Framing is concerned with the transmission of knowledge and particularly the selection, sequencing and pacing of communication (Bernstein, 2000 p.12-14) or 'the ways in which power relations are negotiated in practice' (Chouliaraki, 1998, p.14). Bernstein affirms that where framing is strong the rules of the discourse are explicit and where framing is weak, such rules are implicit.

Linked to the analysis of the recontextualising field is the study of the organisations which occupy that field. Dimmock (2007, p.293) provides three dimensions of communicated authority and control within organisations. First, he distinguishes between formal and informal rules, regulations and procedures. Formal organisations are seen as conforming to 'classic bureaucracies' whereas informal organisations tend to have few rules and regulations. The second dimension is concerned with whether there is 'tight' or 'loose' commitment to 'shared beliefs, values and practices'. Lastly, the 'direct – indirect' dimension is concerned with the degree of delegation of tasks within the organisation.

3.2.3 Pedagogic discourse

Bernstein refers to those individuals and groups who have possession of the Device as having symbolic control over pedagogic discourse. He himself defines pedagogic discourse as 'the rule that embeds a discourse of competence (skills of various kinds) into a discourse of social order in such a way that the latter always dominates the former' (Bernstein, 1990, p.183, brackets original); the former being *instructional discourse* and the latter being *regulative discourse* which creates identity. He argues convincingly that there is only one discourse – pedagogic discourse – and that most researchers, and for that matter most policy makers, are looking for two 'as if education is about values on the one hand, and about competence on the other' (Bernstein, 2000, p.32). The dominant regulative discourse, which is referred to as creating a 'moral regulation' (Bernstein, 1990, p.184), embeds the subordinate instructional discourse

which carries the specialist knowledge and skills. The relationship between the two is often represented as follows:

$$\frac{Instructional\ discourse}{Regulative\ discourse} = \frac{ID}{RD}$$

Bernstein was never concerned with the context specifics[7] of his theory but with the 'possibilities of constructing the sociological nature of pedagogic knowledge' (Bernstein, 2000, p.25). To clarify, the possible forms of regulatory discourse under consideration in this research include globalisation, professionalisation agendas and deregulation (c.f. p.26). Instructional discourse includes the multitude of identities for teachers which influence the textual codification of professional knowledge.

3.3 Becoming a critical discourse analyst

As outlined by Titscher et al., the general principles of CDA include social not linguistic concerns and 'a relationship between the text and its social conditions, ideologies and power-relations' (Titscher et al., 2000, p.146). van Dijk goes further by suggesting that CDA is 'dissident research' and that 'critical discourse analysts take explicit positions' (van Dijk, 2008, p.85).

Widdowson (1995) is an outspoken critic of CDA. He points to conceptual confusion and contradiction when in the pursuit of both analysis and interpretation. The thrust of Widdowson's argument is that analysts must suspend their preconceptions when examining the data, whereas interpretation should give priority to the perspective of the reader with their background views, ideologies, experiences and dispositions. Hence, for Widdowson, CDA is a contradiction in terms as it is not 'analysis' but an exercise in 'interpretation'. In response, Fairclough (1996) challenges Widdowson's restrictive definition of analysis and his characterisation of critical analysts as political ideologues. Fairclough suggests that those using CDA would not necessarily subscribe to any 'political' ideology, as opposed to ideologies encompassing background and covert assumptions; for example, the worth of self-regulation for teachers and the merits of this as a professional goal.

Fairclough's description of analysis is quite broad, in contrast to Widdowson's 'narrow view' and would appear to be rather vague, as Widdowson points out. It would however be very difficult for even the most dedicated research entirely to 'suspend their preconceptions'. On this basis Bloor & Bloor (2007, p.4) state persuasively that

[7] Bernstein was never concerned with the empirical application of the Pedagogic Device. Much of this was left to his followers.

discourse analysts must be 'critical and open about their own position', hence, this is the approach which will be adopted throughout the analysis chapters.

3.3.1 Social, discourse and text analysis

The version of CDA adopted for this analysis draws on the representation of social events as text (Fairclough, 2003) in the form of policy documents, press releases, political manifestos, interview transcripts etc. Fairclough affirms that such events are determined by social structures, social practices and social events. Social structures provide the large ideas and 'set of possibilities' (ibid) but these are not directly translated into events (text). Hoey refers to writers (actors) having the control of interactions which leads to the production of the language of text events (Hoey, 2001, p.11). Hence, as part of Fairclough's account of CDA, social practices which operate between social structures and social events, are defined as 'particular ways of acting' (Fairclough, 2003, p.25) that have a role in shaping social events (together with other agents involved in the events). They are the actions, forms of communication and processes which are mediate between 'what is possible' and 'what is actual' (ibid, p.223).

Social practices provide the mediating organising entities (Fairclough, 2003, p.23) composed of linguistic networks called 'orders of discourse' (ibid, p.24). These circulate within institutions, controlling and prioritising certain forms of communication. Such orders of discourse include the meetings, discussions and interactions in the reviews of teaching standards. Orders of discourse are sub-classified into genres, discourses, and styles which correspond with three types of meaning in text: action, representation and identification. Important for this research is the way in which the analytical categories of the Pedagogic Device and CDA are combined.

3.4 Combining the Pedagogic Device with CDA

Bernstein himself never engaged with the analysis of recontextualisation as an empirical exercise. Nevertheless, he does refer to a 'dynamic relationship' (2000, p.18) between text and the 'interactional practice' that develop 'pedagogic texts' (Bernstein, 1990, p.17). Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) argue strongly that textual forms of analysis naturally lend themselves to studying the Pedagogic Device. It is through the incorporation of CDA within Bernstein's theoretical framework that allows for identification of the pedagogic discourse and recontextualising rules of the reviews.

Woodside-Jiron, in an analysis of the implementation of reading schemes in California in the 1990s, combined Bernstein's Pedagogic Device with Fairclough's concepts as a way of offering a 'more complete understanding of the social analysis present in CDA'

(Woodside-Jiron, 2011, p.156). This involved identifying and interpreting the nominalisation of ideological positions within policy documents and delineating the dominant regulatory discourse from the subservient instructional discourse. He does this by directly linking three contexts of discourse (local, institutional and societal) with instructional discourse, regulative discourse and the Pedagogic Device. Kang (2014) is critical of this direct read-across as he argues that the same texts contain elements of both regulative and instructional discourse and cannot be separated. He presents a looser model than the one provided by Woodside-Jiron which illustrates a relationship between the Pedagogic Device and CDA that treats regulative and instructional discourse as being combined in text. This research seeks to take a middle line between these two models (table 1) in acknowledging that, on the one hand, the Pedagogic Device and CDA cannot be wedded together in an inflexible way but, on the other hand, a degree of coordination between the two is required to determine fully the nature of the pedagogic discourse and recontextualising rules.

The combination of CDA and the Pedagogic Device is particularly suited to this form of work, as both Bernstein's concept of recontextualisation and elements of Fairclough's social practices have regulatory functions. Additionally, the individuals and groups occupying the recontextualising field do have representation in text. CDA provides the means and tools to determine the social practices of those involved as they appear through the textual representation of the events including the documents emanating from the field. Finally, both the Pedagogic Device and CDA recognise the importance of ideology in the production of pedagogic discourse.

In table 1 both the Pedagogic Device and CDA are mapped onto the research questions as they move between pedagogic contexts (global, national and local). Fairclough (2005) talks of discourse moving across 'scalar boundaries' as it is recontextualsied from the global to the national and local (the Review and Writing Groups of the teaching standards would be local in this sense). In this respect, the research questions should be viewed as a series of events leading to the final representation of the teaching standards in their textual form. The table shows the relationship between CDA and the Pedagogic Device.

Specific ways in which the Pedagogic Device and CDA will be used to provide a unique lens on the events of the review of teaching standards will now be considered; these follow Fairclough's analytical categories of genre, styles, discourse and intertextuality. It should be noted that while this section provides the overall approach to combining the theoretical and analytical frameworks, section 4.4 introduces the specific analytical tools for the data analysis.

Table 1: The theoretical and analytical framework. ***Diagrammatic representation of the interrelationship between Bernstein's (2000) Pedagogic Device and Fairclough's (2003) CDA. Adapted from Woodside-Jiron (2011, p.156, table 8.1) and Kang (2014, p.74, figure 4.2). Arrows represented the generalised movement from the global to the national contexts of discourse. The dashed boundaries represent the porous relationship between concepts of the Pedagogic Device and the analytical categories of CDA.***

Research questions	Context of discourse	Pedagogic Device	CDA analytical categories (social practices and intertextuality)
1. How was the case made for replacing the existing Teaching Standards in England and Scotland? ⇩ 2. Which policy actors occupied the recontextualising field of the reviews, how were they selected and what identities did they bring to the review process? ⇩ 3. How were the English and Scottish reviews of Teaching Standards regulated? ⇩ 4. What is the official knowledge basis for teachers informing the *Teachers' Standards* in England and the *Professional Standards for Teachers* in Scotland?	**Global** ⇩ **National** ⇩ **Local**	**Recontextualising principle** selects agents and regulates (recontextualising rules) the work of individuals who construct pedagogic discourse (classification and framing).	**External relations of text** **Genres - action** Genres (institutional practices), genre chains, argumentation, globalisation, 'expert' authority.
		Recontextualising field is the site of relocation and refocusing of pedagogic discourse. Bernstein (2000) refers to pedagogic discourse passing through ideological 'screens'.	**Styles - identification** Ideology (groups bringing together ideas and traditions), expertise, 'institutional context of pedagogy'.
		Pedagogic discourse consisting of **regulative discourse**, the dominant moral discourse of decision makers, and an embedded **instructional discourse** that 'creates specialised skills and their relationship to each other' (Bernstein, 2000, p.32).	**Discourse - representation** Recontextualisation and transformation, governance and regulation, nominalisation.
		Pedagogic texts as the product of pedagogic discourse.	**Internal and intertextual relations of text** Text produced by other texts and assumptions. Semantics, grammar, vocabulary.

3.4.1 Genre and action

Fairclough refers to genres as ways of 'acting and interacting discoursally' (Fairclough, 2003, p.26); for example, a report might be a more generalised 'pre-genre' and a job interview adopts a particular 'situated genre' (ibid, p.216). Chouliaraki extends this definition and refers to genres as 'linguistic practices' associated with 'institutional practices' Chouliaraki (1998, p.11), which regulate the relocation and ordering of pedagogic discourse. Of interest to this analysis is the movement of linguistic practices through different interconnected genres to form different genre chains. These, as Fairclough points out, are significant in the process of recontextualisation. For example, how a particular narrative form, or generalised organising text, makes its way from government speeches and policy documents into the final text of teaching standards. Fairclough believes that this is a facet of globalisation, when regulation is transferred from a distance to localised areas. The different genre can operate in the same text; this is known as 'genre mixing' (Fairclough, 2003, p.34).

This research is particularly concerned with the modes of argumentation in the justification of policy positions developed within the Pedagogic Device. Theo van Leeuwen points to the questions: 'Why should we do this?' or 'Why should we do this in this way?' (van Leeuwen, 2007, p.93). He affirms that only through the use of arguments can sufficient responses be provided to these questions rather than mere explanations, particularly when supporting controversial positions. Fairclough (2003, p.72) talks of argumentation providing 'generic structure' across a genre chain, feeding through a series of texts. The claims, warrants and backings (Toulmin, 1988) which form the basis of augmented positions provide the means of assessing the strength of argument and detecting the presence of underlying assumptions.

Habermas argues that the role of the modern state is to support a market-orientated social order through keeping 'dysfunctional side effects within acceptable limits' (Habermas, 1979). This relies on a version of Max Weber's rational-legal authority and the acceptance of the legitimators, much of whose work is textual (Fairclough, 2003, p.219). However, this is frequently insufficient for a policy position to be widely accepted. For example, the action of legitimising a policy position often also requires 'eliciting consent'[8] (Fontana, 2009, p.94) of the individual or institution implementing it. This constitutes a particular recontextualising principle. van Leeuwen (2007, p.98) identifies three forms of authority that are of interest to this research: personal, expert and conformity. First, there is a form of authority derived from an authoritative individual

[8] Fontana (2009, p.94) refers to Gramsci's 'systems of hegemonic equilibrium' combining force and consent to achieve political goals.

or a series of rules or regulations (we do it because the law states it). Fairclough recognises institutional authority as a variant on personal authority (Fairclough, 2003, p.98). Second, there is a form of authority that conforms to customs of tradition and conformity (we have always done it this way). Finally, there is a form of authority derived from an expert or role model (we do this because the expert says we should).

3.4.2 Styles and identification

The description of how the Pedagogic Device and CDA were combined now switches to focus on identity and ways of being. This is relevant to the second research question where the occupation of the recontextualising field provides the focus. Benwell and Stokoe (2006) point to the links between identity at the 'micro-discursive level' and 'expression of an ideological position' at the macro level. This analysis particularly focuses on how group and individual identity are projected through text and how this maps onto larger scale ideological positions. Bernstein points out that individuals adopt ideological 'screens' within the recontextualising field, sometimes assuming different positions depending on the audience (identity mixing). Within this research, ideology is referred to in a broad sense as the collection of ideas, traditions and dispositions that are brought to bear on policy and the text of teaching standards. Bernstein (2000, p.115) describes agents of the recontextualising field as bringing ideological 'screens' to filter discourses on their way to forming pedagogic discourse. Fairclough refers to ideology in a critical sense as 'representations of aspects of the world which can be shown to contribute to establishing, maintaining and changing social relations of power, domination and exploitation' (Fairclough, 2003, p.9). van Dijk (1998), who has explored the links between ideology and discourse, stresses the social aspects of ideological work and, importantly for this research, the role of groups in reproducing ideologies for a wider audience. This research therefore uses a conception of ideology that is concerned with the roles of groups in the way that ideas and traditions are brought together to establish or maintain a social order among teachers. A second form of identity of interest to this research, which links closely with the concept of authority, is one associated with the 'expert'. This is concerned with how the expert status is achieved and sustained. By achieving expert status policy actors can occupy the recontextualising field and gain control over the development and flow of pedagogic discourse.

3.4.3 Discourse and representation

Discourse in this sense is representations of the world and, in relation to textual analysis, the representations of individuals, groups and ideas within text. This research draws on the concepts of representation through recontextualisation and

representation of social actors. Once discourse is relocated as part of a social practice, recontextualisation is taking place according to a set of implicit or explicit recontextualising rules. Fairclough (2005) identifies a process of 'reweaving' where new discourses are developed from older ones as part of a recontextualisation and provides an important linking concept between the Pedagogic Device and CDA. In fact, Bernstein (1996) identifies recontextualisation with representation of individuals and institutions, whereas van Leeuwen & Wodak (1999) strongly link recontextualisation with transformation. Such transformation is dependent on the 'interests, goals and values of the context into which the practice is recontextualized' (van Leeuwen & Wodak, 1999, p.96). Titscher, Meyer et al. (2000, p.157) point out that recontextualisation need not just be associated with the shifting of meaning between different genres but can operate within a single genre where different versions of similar text are produced. For the purpose of this research then, recontextualisation is the movement of discourse as part of a social practice either within a single genre or between multiple genres.

Bernstein's demarcation of the official recontextualising field (ORF) and the pedagogic recontextualising field (PRF) provides the theoretical apparatus for assessing who regulates the pedagogic discourse. A closer look at Fairclough's work shows that where Bernstein (2000) discusses issues of regulation, Fairclough introduces us to the concept of 'governance'. Governance is referred to as 'any activity within an institution or organization directed at regulating some other (network of) social practice(s)' (Fairclough, 2003, p.32). It is within these social practices that elements are 'filterd' with some brought to the fore. More specifically, as Fairclough points out, genres of governance have the property of connecting the local to the national and global contexts.

Singh, Thomas et al. (2013) identify those agents selected through a recontextualising principle and occupying the recontextualising field as 'mid-level policy actors'. They argue that mid-level policy actors play a significant role in translating policy for more general consumption and mediating between the ORF and PRF. In a similar way, (Fairclough, 2003) uses the term 'social actors'[9] to represent such individuals and groups and it is the representation of such 'actors' through text that is a focus for this research. This includes those individuals and groups occupying the ORF and PRF.

[9] The two terms 'mid-level policy actor' and 'social actor' will from now on be combined to from 'policy actor' to represent the individuals who formed part of the reviews of teaching standards in England and Scotland.

3.4.4 Intertextual relations of text

Another element of Fairclough's analysis is the 'external relations of text' (Fairclough, 2003, p.39). Although this form of analysis sits outside the 'orders of discourse', it does provide a useful means of understanding the relationship between texts. When different texts operate in this way what ensues is what Fariclough refers to as intertextual relations of texts, or 'intertextuality'. Chouliaraki (1998, p.10) points to intertextuality as one area where there is significant crossover between the Pedagogic Device and CDA. Both Bernstein's 'pedagogic texts' and Fairclough's 'internal relations of text' provide clues and hints as to the events and practices that were brought together to form texts. Other texts can feed into the process of text-formation where certain texts are brought to the fore and others are backgrounded as part of the process. Fairclough (2003, p.40-41) identifies three themes for this form of text analysis. The first is a form of social difference where interest groups vie for influence and to assert or impose their identities. Within this there is a contrast made between the dialogical nature of intertextuality and the suppressive nature of assumption. Fairclough's second theme is concerned with hegemony and 'achieving a measure of success in projecting certain particulars as universal' (ibid, p.41). Finally, ideology is an important element in explaining the links between intertextuality and hegemony.

Chapter 4: Methodology

4.1 Introduction

The research informing this thesis centres on the rules and regulations associated with the construction of the English and Scottish teaching standards - the *Teachers' Standards* (DfE, 2012b) in England and the *Professional Standards for Teachers* (2012f; g; h) in Scotland. The research aimed for an empirically-grounded account using a mixed qualitative approach of documentary analysis and semi-structured interviews (Driver, 2003).

The analysis of the data takes on a different form in each of the four following analysis chapters. First (chapter 5), there is a focus on the case made for the reviews of teaching standards across the two nations. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999) and argument analysis (Toulmin, 1988) are used as the principal analytical tools.

The second part (chapter 6) of the analysis focuses on the identities of those involved in the drafting of the teaching standards in England and Scotland. Bernstein's (2000) concept of the recontextualising field is used to help make sense of the appointment processes to, and identities of those involved in, the writing and drafting groups.

Third (chapter 7), there is a focus on the regulation of the reviews of teaching standards – what Bernstein (2000) refers to at the 'recontextualising principle'. The particular emphasis here is on the institutional culture within the recontextualising field.

Last (chapter 8), the analysis addresses the pedagogising of teachers' professional knowledge and teachers' identities within the teaching standards. Here, CDA is used to analyse both the standards themselves and related documents.

At this point, it is important to make clear a distinction between text and discourse. Bloor & Bloor (2007, p.7) provide a definition of text as 'a linguistic record of a communicative event' and Widdowson (2004, p.8) provides a good definition of discourse as a 'pragmatic process of meaning negotiation', with text being its 'product'. This definition is suitable for this study as the research seeks to uncover the 'negotiated meaning' associated with the development of teaching standards.

The mixed qualitative approaches to documentary analysis and semi-structured interviews are combined to cover fully the research questions. The intent here is not to triangulate the findings across the two sources, but to provide two data sets on which to base the analysis. Hence, each data set is considered separately and as of equal importance. This then necessitates running in parallel, and sometimes overlapping, the

two contrasting qualitative methods. As Gorard & Taylor (2004, p.45) suggest, 'in social science two different sets of observations cannot be used both to check up on each other and for triangulation'. Mindful of this, it is important to view the methods – documentary analysis and semi-structured interviews - as mutually complementary and not as triangulation.

Barbour warns that 'mixing qualitative methods may actually involve several potentially divergent qualitative paradigms' with 'each characterized by different assumptions in terms of the theoretical frameworks that we bring to bear on our research' (Barbour, 1998, p.353). Clearly, applying different qualitative approaches from diverse paradigms in parallel may introduce complexity to the research process and possibly challenge the claim of rigour. Within this research however, there are two reasons for adopting this mixed qualitative approach.

The first reason is related to the functions of the text generated from the document analysis and the transcribing of interviews. The document analysis seeks to identify, what Titscher, Meyer et al. refer to as the 'manifest components of communication' (Titscher, Meyer et al., 2000, p.32). This means that the interpretation of the documents seeks to reflect the views and positions of the authors. The interview transcription however, portray 'manifest reflection of communication' (ibid) in so far as they recall the events and process for the reviews of teaching standards with little or no hidden meaning. Thus, each research method assumes a slightly different epistemological approach.

The second reason for adopting this approach to the research relates to the modes of analysis. Where the theoretical foundations are provided by Bernstein's (2000) Pedagogic Device, CDA is used as the principal analytical tool for the textual analysis of documents and interview transcripts. Given that this broad form of analysis seeks to identify both the pedagogic discourse and regulation of the reviews, it is important to have both documentary and interview material available to fully meet the research aims.

4.2 Phase one of the data collection: the documentary analysis

The educational policy landscapes in England and Scotland provide contrasting contextual situations in which to develop teaching standards. Previous similar comparative studies (Hulme & Menter, 2011; Menter, Brisard et al., 2006; Menter, Mahony et al., 2004) have used reviews of associated documents as a principal research method. The availability of such documents has ensured that textual analysis has been the research method of choice for most investigations of this policy area. This research requires a precise selection of texts for analysis from the wide range of

documents available. Consequently, the procedure provided by Titscher, Meyer et al. (2000, pp.33-34) formed the basis for the collection of textual materials and selection of extracts for analysis. This involved a three-stage process involving the selection of appropriate documents for analysis, the identification of relevant sections in these documents, and finally, identification of the units of text for analysis.

4.2.1 Collection and selection of documents for analysis

The first stage of this phase of the research was to select those documents which provide an insight into the review processes and associated events. Documents were selected based on their relationship to the teaching standards reviews and included government policy documents and speeches, documents written by review group members, responses to consultations and documents with known input to government policy in this area. In order successfully to filter the most appropriate documents, a three-stage protocol (table 2) was adopted. This ensured that relevant documents relating to the research questions were selected (section 1.2).

Table 2: The documentary selection protocol.

Document selection protocol

1. **Documents relating to the wider political context and ideological debates surrounding teachers' professional knowledge including, political speeches, manifestos and press releases, government-commissioned reports, management consultant and think tank reports. This analysis provides the political narrative around and within the reviews and largely relates to the first research question.**
2. **Documents, papers and reports relating to teachers' professional knowledge and teaching standards authored by those individuals and institutions either involved in or sitting outside the review process. These documents gave insight into the ideologies and backgrounds of individuals and institutions occupying the recontextualising field (ORF and PRF) of the reviews.**
3. **Documents relating to the teaching standards themselves and the associated reviews including reports on the review processes and responses to consultations.**

This procedure was used to identify the most appropriate documents for analysis, from the texts available. This involved use of the library at the Institute of Education (University College, London), Internet searches and, where documents were not in the public domain, requests made for copies from the appropriate institution. On occasions, documentary recommendations were made by those interviewed as part of the data

collection. A list of the documents selected, with accompanying commentaries, is provided in tables 3, 4 and 5.

When the document had been identified, a process of isolating the relevant sections of text took place involving reading and rereading to identify the areas where key concepts related to the research questions were discussed. While some of the documents were solely concerned with the reviews of teaching standards, others were on the fringes of this process.

Table 3: Selected documents from the political and policy landscape (global and national).

Document type	England	Scotland
Management consultant reports	The McKinsey & Company report; *How the world's best performing school systems come out on top* (Barber & Mourshed, 2007); this influential and much-quoted report has often been used by governments to inform policy decisions.	
Government speeches, manifestos and press releases	Speeches by the Secretary of State for Education to the National College for Leadership of Schools Annual Conference in 2010 and 2011 (Gove, 2010; 2011). DfE press releases (2011d; e) announcing the start and completion of the *Independent Review of Teachers' Standards*.	*Scottish National Party Manifesto 2011* (SNP, 2011); the manifesto produced for the 2011 Scottish Parliament elections. The SNP became the majority government in Scotland after this election and the wider political approach to education is outlined.
Think tank and government-commissioned reports and policy documents	The Policy Exchange report; *More Good Teachers* (Freedman, Lipson et al., 2008); from the centre-right think tank favoured and part-founded by Michael Gove MP, Secretary of State for Education from 2010 to 2014. One of the authors of the report went on to become a special advisor to Michael Gove. *The Case for Change* (DfE, 2010a) provided justification in support of the UK Government's proposed changes to teaching in advance of the publication of The 2010 Schools White Paper. *The Importance of Teaching, The Schools White Paper* (DfE, 2010b, p.25); outlined a raft of proposals including reform to teacher education and the announcement of the review of the existing teaching standards.	*Teaching Scotland's Future, Report of a review of teacher education in Scotland* by Graham Donaldson (2011); the highly influential and widely-referenced report made 50 recommendations to the Scottish Government. *Continuing to build excellence in teaching: The Scottish Government's Response to Teaching Scotland's Future* (Scottish Government, 2011). *The Report to the Cabinet Secretary for Education and Life-Long Learning* (Scottish Government, 2012b) by the National Partnership Group, which was formed to consider how the recommendations from the Donaldson Review come be implemented. *Learning for Sustainability: The Report of the One Planet Schools Working Group* (Scottish Government, 2012a); a Scottish Government report looking at how sustainability can be built into the education system.

Table 4: Selected documents authored by individuals and institutions occupying the recontextualising field (local).

Document sources	England	Scotland
Members of the ORF	*Who teaches the teachers?* (O'Hear, 1988); a pamphlet written by Professor Anthony O'Hear, a member of the *Teachers' Standards* Review and Drafting Group, for the right-leaning think-tank, The Social Affair Unit. *The 2012 Teachers' Standards in the Classroom* (Blatchford, 2013), written by Roy Blatchford who was the Deputy Chair of the Review Group and Chair of the Drafting Group. *Sally Coates at the Conservative Party Conference 2011*, YouTube clip (BurlingtonDanes1699, 2011), this is a clip of the speech made by Sally Coates to the Conference. *Headstrong: 11 Lessons of School Leadership*, an account by Sally Coates of her leadership strategies used at Burlington Danes School (Coates, 2015).	The University of Edinburgh's Gillian Robinson, whose thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Education was *Knowing Why and Daring to be Different: Becoming and Being Teachers-as-Learners* (Robinson, 2010). *Supporting and Strengthening the Quality of Teaching*; Graham Donaldson's presentation to the Holyrood Conference, October 2012 (Donaldson, 2012). *A manifesto for 2011: time for a one planet Scotland* (WWF, 2010); the manifesto from the World Wildlife Fund in the lead-up to the 2011 Scottish Parliament Elections. *Leading Collaborative Professional Enquiry: Implications for Teachers, Chartered Teachers and their Managers,* Doctorate in Education thesis by Alison Fox (Fox, 2009).
Members of the PRF	Correspondence between the Universities' Council for the Education of Teachers (UCET, 2011) and Nick Gibb MP, then Minister for Schools (DfE, 2011c) about their exclusion from the Review Group. *Proposed changes to the teacher disciplinary and induction regulations following the abolition of the General Teaching Council for England, response from the GTCS* (Hamilton, 2011). This response identifies some of the difficulties of combining teaching standards with codes of conduct.	*By Diverse Means: improving Scottish Education, the Commission on School Reform Final Report* (CSPP, 2013); a report by The Centre for Scottish Public Policy (CSPP). This group, from across the political spectrum in Scotland, presents an approach to education policy based on increasing economic prosperity for Scotland.

Table 5: The teaching standards and related documents (local).

Document type	England	Scotland
The Teaching Standards and related documents	*The Teachers' Standards* (DfE, 2012b). This original version is used for the analysis rather than the updated 2013 version in which there are some marginal presentational differences. *The Terms of Reference for the Independent Review of Teachers' Standards* (DfE, 2011g); was the two-page document that set the aims for the Review of the Teachers' Standards. *Good Medical Practice, General Medical Council* (GMC, 2014), which has some similarity with the *Teachers' Standards*.	*The Standards for Registration: mandatory requirements for Registration with the General Teaching Council for Scotland* (GTCS, 2012h), containing The Standard for Provisional Registration and The Standard for Full Registration. *The Standards for Career-Long Professional Development: supporting the development of teacher professional learning* (GTCS, 2012f); *The Standards for Leadership and Management: supporting leadership and management development* (GTCS, 2012g).
Reports issued by the Review Groups	The *First Report of the Independent Review of the Teachers' Standards, QTS and Core Standards*, Presented to The Secretary of State for Education (DfE, 2011a), this report presented the draft *Teachers' Standards* and a summary of the Review and consultation process. The *Second Report of the Independent Review of Teachers' Standards* (DfE, 2011f) considered whether there should be additional, higher-level, standards.	*The report on the Consultation on the Revision of the Standards* (GTCS, 2012e). *Chief Executive Verbal Report, minutes from the GTC Scotland Council Meeting*, 7th December 2011 (GTCS, 2011).
Draft Standards consultation responses and responses to calls for evidence.	*DfE Review of Teachers' Standards, ATL response,* 10th June 2011 (ATL 2011), the Association of Teachers and Lecturers. *Review of Teachers' Standards, note from Professor Robin Alexander, University of Cambridge Director of the Cambridge Primary Review* (Alexander, 2011), response to the initial call for evidence from the Cambridge Primary Review.	Draft versions of the *Professional Standards for Teachers* (GTCS, 2012b; c; d) release at the start of the consultation process in August 2012. *Consultation on the Review of GTC Scotland Professional Standards, response from the Education Institute of Scotland (EIS)* (EIS, 2012).

4.2.2 Identification of units for analysis

Once the documents for analysis had been identified, a further sampling of the text took place to establish individual units of analysis. Titscher, Meyer et al. identify three criteria for such a procedure: that there be some form of theoretical justification; that they be clearly defined and that they do not overlap (Titscher, Meyer et al., 2000, p.34).

The key theoretical and analytical concepts that form the foundations of the research were introduced in chapter 3 of this thesis. Through application of these concepts to each selected text, a reduction process (table 6) took place. This produced units of analysis which were allocated to one or more of the theoretical concepts. The units of analysis were then subjected to the most appropriate form of CDA (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999; Fairclough, 2000; 2003).

Table 6: documentary text unit analysis protocol.

Unit analysis protocol

1. **An initial reading of the documents (tables 3, 4 and 5) took place to identify sections of texts which referred to areas related to the research questions. These were highlight for future reference.**
2. **Then a process of allocating units of meaning to key concepts identified by the theoretical and analytical concepts took place: ideology, argumentation, globalisation, legitimisation, recontextualisation, identity, ideology, regulation (see table 1, p.36).**
3. **The most appropriate mode of textual analysis using CDA was selected: Genres, Styles, Discourse and Intertextuality.**

In attending to the three criteria identified by Titscher, Meyer et al. (2000), the theoretical grounding for such a protocol is located in the research questions as determined by the aim of the research (to identify the pedagogic discourse and recotextualising principle of the reviews of teaching standards). Second, through the already identified theoretical and analytical framework (table 1) and documents (tables 3. 4 and 5), there is a clearly defined reductive process. Finally, each of the three stages in the protocol have identified separate functions.

The analysis of the individual units of meaning is introduced in section 4.4 of this chapter.

4.3 Phase two of the data collection: elite interviews

The second phase of the data collection – elite interviews with policy actors of the recontextualising field – was designed to provide an additional analytical approach to

the research questions. The aims were to elicit the accounts of those who were involved in the teaching standards review process, to establish how the review was conducted and to consider the nature of the pedagogic discourse. This involved designing an interview process for key players in the review of teaching standards.

4.3.1 Constructing the interview process

When designing an interview process, it is important to consider producing one which acknowledges the differing conceptions of rigour, the conflict between competing philosophical positions and the political nature of education (Hammersley, 2007). Given the flexible requirement of this phase of the research, semi-structured interviews (Driver, 2003) were considered the most appropriate interview technique because they allowed for an 'interchange of views' (Cohen et al., 2007, p.349) and helped to address some of the difficulties mentioned above. Given the nature of the semi-structured interview, it was important to ground the process in some unifying criteria. Tong et al. (2007) identify a 32-item check list for carrying out interviews in health care research. Some of those criteria were relevant to this research, such as those that cover researcher qualifications, the design of the study and analysis of the findings. Whether these or any other criteria can be used as guidelines to judge the quality of qualitative research is debatable. Nonetheless, to have no criteria would cast doubt on the rigour and standing of the qualitative educational research.

The interviews were exploratory in nature and sought to generate propositional knowledge and understanding while keeping to pre-set themes identified on the interview schedules (appendix 1 and 2). The interview schedules – comprising questions, probes and prompts – clearly identified the areas to be covered and acted as a signpost for the interview. In constructing the interview schedule, it was important to link the interview questions to the overall research questions, to enable all key areas to be covered. The interview questions were developed during the initial documentary analysis phase under different headings related to the overall research questions. Once a first draft of the interview schedules had been developed, an editing process took place in discussion with the doctoral supervisors.

It was felt most important to try to elicit an accurate participant account of the reviews of teaching standards. The questions were designed to allow participants to speak freely and openly about the topic. This included using open-ended questions, follow-up questions and prompts to enable the interviewee to add detail to the information they had already provided. The first section of the schedule aimed to obtain background information about the respondent while further questions were designed to elicited accounts of the review process, including their own views of the process and

outcomes. Ethical consent was sought using the King's College, London ethical consent procedure and granted by the Research Ethics Panel on 7th November 2013 (this expired on 7th November 2015).

4.3.2 Sampling for elite interviews

The research set out to elicit the accounts of key players occupying the recontextualising field (c.f. p.35). Given the identity and small number of individuals, or 'policy actors' (c.f. p.43), involved in the reviews of teaching standards, it was appropriate to consider them as experts or 'professional elites' (Odendahl & Shaw, 2002). The concept of an elite interview is predicated on the interviewee having specific characteristics or knowledge within their field (Littig, 2009). This definition was extended in the research to consider members of the review and writing groups of the teaching standards in England and Scotland, the official recontextualising field (ORF), and those who occupied the areas on the fringes or outside these groups, the pedagogic recontextualising field (PRF).

The elite interview often presents barriers to access requiring considerable perseverance (Odendahl & Shaw, 2002) and access is often through gatekeepers, such as personal assistants. In order increase the likelihood of securing interviews, one strategy deployed was to offer a telephone interview as an alternative to a more time-intensive face-to-face exchange. Additionally, where a face-to-face interview was possible, it took place in a location of the participant's choice.

Due to the unique characteristics of many of the potential interviewees, a purposive method to sampling (Cohen, Manion et al., 2007, p.114) was adopted involving identifying and approaching particular members of the recontextualising field (Bernstein, 2000). In England, the names and biographies of members of the *Independent Review of Teachers' Standards* (herein referred to as the Review) (appendix 4) were accessed from the Department for Education (DfE) website. Ten of the 15 members of the group, incorporating a range of different types of institutions and individuals (the ORF), were contacted with interview requests. This sample was selected to include sector representatives, head-teachers and members of the Drafting Group. Given that the Review was formed in 2011, several of the contact institutions were no longer current and further internet-based searches were required to locate these participants.

In order to sample from significant players outside of the Review, and hence part of the PRF (c.f. p.35), members of the group that developed the 2007 *Professional Standards for Teachers* (TDA, 2007) in England were used as a starting point for potential interview requests. Also, some key institutions who responded to the *Teachers'*

Standards call for evidence (DfE, 2011a), but were excluded from the Review itself, were contacted to enquire whether representatives would be willing to take part. These included the General Teaching Council for England and the Universities' Council for the Education of Teachers (UCET).

In regards to the revision of the *Professional Standards for Teachers in Scotland*, the list of participants involved in the Steering Group and three Writing Groups (appendix 5) was accessed via the General Teaching Council for Scotland's website. In contrast to the Review in England, where the Drafting Group was formed from the members of the Review itself, the members of the Steering Group in Scotland did not contribute members to the three Writing Groups. Writing Group 1 – *Standards for Registration* (GTCS, 2012h) consisted of nine members; Writing Group 2 – *Standard for Career-Long Professional Learning* (GTCS, 2012f) consisted of eight members; and Writing Group 3 – *Standards for Leadership and Management* consisted of six members. It was deemed important for this research to recruit interviewees from across these three separate Writing Groups and also to have coverage of the various institutions represented. In contrast to the situation in England, at the start of the interview process, there was no clearly identifiable PRF outside of the Steering and Writing Groups in Scotland because of the more inclusive nature of policy formation.

4.3.3 Securing interviews

It was decided that five interviews would be conducted in relation to the *Independent Review of Teachers' Standards* in England and a further six interviews for the revision of the *Professional Standards for Teachers in Scotland*. As the interviews formed part of a mixed-methods approach, together with analysis of documentary evidence, this number of interviews was deemed appropriate to effectively cover and address the research questions (c.f. p.12). The additional interview in Scotland, compared to the sample in England, was considered a requirement to ensure all the Writing Groups were sufficiently represented.

Initially, all interview targets were formally approached by letter, with an enclosed information sheet, addressed to their listed institution of work. The contact addresses were obtained via the documents relating to the teaching standards reviews or via institution websites. The letter explained the purpose of the research and the nature of the interview request. Contact details were provided for interview targets to respond to the letter including the researcher's King's College email address and work office telephone number. In situations where a letter was not answered, the individual's place of work was contacted to request alternative contact information, such as an email address. Once an initial agreement to take part in the interview process had been

reached, further correspondence was conducted by email. Written consent, using a pre-designed consent form, was sought and obtained at the start of each interview.

In England, 13 individuals were contacted to take part, from which five interviews were secured. Three of the interviews were conducted face-to-face between January and May 2014. The other two interviews were conducted via the telephone. It was important to make available this option as these interviews may not have been secured if only face-to-face interviews were offered. While this sample did include most of the institution types represented on the Review, neither of the practising teachers responded to requests for interviews despite extensive efforts[10] made to locate them at new employing schools. Initially, at the time of the Review, both teachers were employed in academy schools run by the ARK academy chain. This presented a subsection of a subsection in that only teachers from academies were present on the Review and that they were both from the ARK academy chain.

Elsewhere within the sample, there was good coverage of the head-teachers present and an interview was secured with a member of the Drafting Group. Outside of the Review Group, interviews were conducted with a policy advisor at the Department for Education at the time and a representative from UCET. It was, however, not possible to conduct an interview with a representative from the General Teaching Council for England which had been disbanded by the time the interviews were conducted. Overall though there was good coverage of the key stakeholders in England through both the interviews and documentary evidence.

In Scotland, nine individuals were contacted with interview requests from which six interviews were secured. This sample included representation from the Steering Group and three Writing Groups including local authority, head-teacher, teacher and higher education institutions. All the interviewees had some involvement, to varying degrees, with the development of the revised standards. Four interviews were conducted face-to-face in two trips to Edinburgh in May and again in August 2014. The other two interviews were conducted via telephone. A commentary of the interviews conducted in England and Scotland is provided in table 7.

[10] This included internet searches and telephone calls to the schools where they were employed to ensure the most appropriate postal and email addresses were used to contact them.

Table 7: Pen portraits of those interviewed as part of the research.

Institutions and positions	**'Policy actors' of the recontextualising field.**	
	England	**Scotland**
Local authority and/or new teacher induction	**Interview 1**: A member of the Review Group who saw themselves as representing both the Independent Sector and Teacher Induction. Had previously taught in the Independent Sector.	**Interview 4**: A former secondary head-teacher and now local authority official on Writing Group 1. Had previously worked for the Scottish Council for the Research in Education.
Head-teacher	**Interview 2**: A secondary school principal who was a member of the Review Group and Drafting Group. **Interview 4**: A secondary school principal/head-teacher with a pivotal role in the Review Group.	**Interview 1**: A head-teacher and a member of Writing Group 1. They previously had worked at GTC Scotland, completed the Scottish Qualification for Headship and a modular Master's Degree They had also been on secondment to Education Scotland.
Government advisor or civil servant	**Interview 5**: A former Government advisor at the time of the Review who previously co-authored an influential think tank report on teacher education.	**Interview 3**: A civil servant within the Scottish Government with education policy management responsibilities including work on the independence of GTC Scotland. A Steering Group member.
General teaching councils	A former senior Council Member form the GTC England before disbandment was approached for an interview but there was no response.	**Interview 2**: A former primary head-teacher and now senior policy official at GTC Scotland with responsibility for the development of the standards.
University departments of education	**Interview 3**: A former official at the TDA (Training and Development Agency for Schools) and representative of the university teacher education sector who was excluded from the review process.	**Interview 6**: A former teacher with responsibility for running academic programmes for experienced and middle leaders at a Scottish University. A member of Writing Group 2.
Teacher	It was not possible to secure interviews with the teacher representatives on the Review Group.	**Interview 5**: A teacher and also a Chartered Teacher. A member of Writing Group 2.

4.3.4 Conducting the interviews

Before the interviews took place, it was decided not to provide the respondents with advanced copies of the interview questions for the following reasons. First, by the very nature of the elite interview, the people being asked to take part have limited time available for such activities and it was felt not appropriate, given the time they were already contributing towards the study, for them to have to read through the questions in advance. In addition, the possibility that only some respondents might read the questions and some had not, was undesirable. Second, it was deemed inappropriate for the interviewees to have time to prepare answers in advance in case they deliberately aligned them with an official discourse. The interviews were recorded using a recording app on an iPad and, after transcription by the researcher; participants were sent a copy of the transcription for respondent validation and the opportunity to provide additional comments.

Another consideration for the interview process was the issue of amenity for the interviewees. Due to the nature of the elite interviewing and sampling process, it was not possible to guarantee anonymity in the report for participants; although, on the consent form it was indicated that every effort would be made to do so. Odendahl & Shaw (2002) discuss the importance of confidentiality when interviewing elites. They suggest, when writing final reports, the use of composites and pseudonyms as a means of not revealing the identity of the subject but allowing a 'closer look at patterns and nuances of beliefs and behaviors' (Odendahl & Shaw, 2002, p.313). This process was followed during the report writing. Participants could withdraw their participation during the interview and withdraw their data after their participation at any point up to and the date of the commencement of the report writing. Although names were removed from quotes used in this report, due to the nature of the participants the research sought to interview, it was not possible to absolutely guarantee anonymity. However, it is not believed that the interviews disclosed any personal or sensitive information.

4.3.5 Interview transcription and the preparation of text for analysis

All interviews were recorded using a voice recording application on an iPad. The interviews were played back and transcribed verbatim by the researcher. Care was particularly taken when inserting punctuation in the transcription to ensure that the exact meaning intended by the interviewee was conveyed through the written word. One advantage of the researcher carrying out the transcription was that the 'social and emotional' aspects of the interview were 'reawakened' (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009,

p.180) and some initial analysis, in the form of written notes, was able to take place at this stage. A copy of the transcript was sent to the interviewee for respondent validation or 'member checking' (Mays & Pope, 2000). Three of the eleven interviewees (all Scotland based) responded with amended transcripts and a follow-up telephone conversation was arranged with another interviewee who made verbal corrections and amendments to the transcript. Once the transcription process had been completed, a staged reductive approach was followed to prepare the text for analysis (table 8).

Table 8: The identification of analysis units from the interview transcripts.

Unit analysis protocol

1. **After allowing for amendments and corrections being made by the interviewee, an initial reading of the transcript took place with some initial thoughts and comments added by the researcher.**
2. **Then a process of allocating units of meaning to key concepts identified by the theoretical and analytical concepts took place: ideology, argumentation, globalisation, legitimisation, recontextualisation, identity, ideology, regulation (see table 1, p.40).**
3. **The most appropriate mode of textual analysis using CDA was selected: genres, styles, discourse and intertextuality.**

Mindful of the need to maintain a sense of the holistic form of the interview transcript before a reductive process took place (Cohen, Manion et al., 2007, p.368), summative comments were made on the side of the transcripts. This was followed by a more thorough reading when units of meaning were identified and highlighted. At this point, different approaches to analysing the interview transcriptions were adopted dependent on the theoretical approach used for the analysis. CDA was used with a focus on the language of the interviews. This involved recalling the interview through the text of the transcript and then 'entering into a *dialogue* with the text' (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p.192, italics original) with a focus was on the overall meaning and argument presented in the interview. There were sections of the transcripts that recalled events and processes associated with the reviews. This type of text was treated as if there 'was nothing else 'behind' the text' (Titscher, Meyer et al., 2000, p.32); therefore, no formal interpretation was required as this was a recollection of events. The focus here was on how the various accounts of the reviews fitted together to unpack the control dynamics and ideologies of the reviews.

4.4 Introducing the data analysis

Previously, this chapter has described how data was obtained from the field and prepared for analysis. This section will draw on the theoretical and analytical frameworks introduced in chapter 3 to map out the forms of analysis used in the research and provide an indication as to how they are utilised. The analytical categories used, as introduced in section 3.4, form part of 'the relational view of text' and the 'orders of discourse' (genre, style and discourse) that form part of Norman Fairclough's (2003) CDA. The resulting analytical framework was developed as a series of questions related to the four analytical categories (genre, styles, discourse and intertextuality). Within these identified categories, focal questions have been developed in relation to the overall research aims of identifying the pedagogic discourse and recontextualising rules of the reviews. The development and use of the series of questions was considered the most appropriate analytical tool for a thorough interrogation of the text.

Outlined below is a schema for analysis that draws on the most relevant aspects of CDA required for the analysis of policy and related documents and for the analysis of interviews. Although there will be an indication of how each one relates to the four research questions, they will be used in an interdisciplinary and overlapping way during the analysis chapters. This form of analysis is demonstrated in appendix 6 with a range of documentary and interview extracts.

4.4.1 Genres and action

This area of analysis focuses on three key elements that are most relevant to the identification of the recontextualising rules and pedagogic discourse of the reviews. These include the identification of genre chains, the augmented generic structure and the forms of authoritative legitimisation. Table 9 provides a schema for such analysis with key questions for the interrogation of the text identified. This form of analysis has a particular focus on the first research question in so far as argumentation forms a large part of making the case for the reviews. In this regard, Toulmin (1988) analysis of argument offers a step-by-step approach to analysing the claims presented in the documents. His use of claims, warrants and backing allows for the dissection of augments into the constituent parts. Where warrants are absent or rely on assumptions, the analyisis moves onto establishing 'what' is said in the text against what is 'unsaid' (Fairclough, 2003, p.40).

Chouliaraki (1998, p.11) characterises genres as being 'particular ways of speaking' within an institutional context and it is the movement of these forms of speaking along genre chains that is a focus. In setting up a review process (recontextualising rules)

and making the case for change, this research intends to establish the authority on which these decisions were based. Hence, the research will attempt to access the forms of authority provide for the reviews in England and Scotland.

Table 9: Procedures for the analysis of genres. Adapted from Toulmin (1988), Chouliaraki & Fairclough (1999), Lynne (2013) van Leeuwen (2007) and Fairclough (2003).

Genres and action
Genre chains – movement of genre
What forms of genre or 'linguistic practices' are present in the text?
Are particular instructional practices identifiable through the use of the genre?
What 'regulatory function' is being carried out by the genre?
Has disembedding taken place (movement of genre to different contexts)? Is the text situated within a genre chain (network of interconnected texts)?
Are there instances of genre mixing?
Argumentation – providing generic structure
What is the generic structure of the argument in the text (use Toulmin's analysis)?
1. Find the claim (C): what does the document/interviewee want me to believe? Any implied claims about policy positions need to be made explicit.
2. Warrant (W): what principle(s) links the backing to the claim? Is a warrant absent? If so, why is it absent? Are there any assumptions associated with its absence? Is any particular ideology associated with the assumption?
3. Backing (B): what evidence is provided to support the warrant and the policy position adopted?
4. Rebuttal (R): are other possible policy positions identified? Are they refuted or discussed?
5. Look for qualifiers (Q): is there anything which suggests the claim might be limited? Are there any circumstances where it might not apply? Are there any explicit exceptions to the claim?
Authority - legitimisation
What forms of authority are present: personal, expert, conformity or institutional? How strong are the authority claims?

4.4.2 Styles and identities

In section 3.4.3 the links between Bernstein's (2000) ideological 'screens' and Fairclough's (2003) identity are made. By way of extension, this part of the analysis

aims to draw from the selected texts the identity of policy actors occupying the recontextualising field and the relative strength of their commitment to ideologies. This utilises the internal relations of text such as grammar and vocabulary to assess the relative commitment to an identity. For example, Fairclough refers to modality as 'what people commit themselves to when they make statements' (Fairclough, 2003, p.165), but also there are notions of doubt, probability as well as certainty. Two forms of expertise are of concern to the research: bureaucratic and mediated. Bureaucratic expertise is, for example, associated with a government official where expertise is not likely to enter the public domain. Mediated expertise requires the 'skills of public relations' to mediate the nature of the expertise to the wider public (ibid, p.187). Table 10 provides the schema for the analysis.

Table 10: Procedures for analysing styles. Adapted from Fairclough (2003, pp.159-190).

Styles and identities
Social identify and personal identity (personality)
What identities do the 'policy actors' of the review groups adopt? Are these informed by any particular ideology?
To what extent is the identification with the individual (I) or with the collective (we)?
What types of speech functions are used to convey modality?
What degrees of commitment are communicated through the modalised form (certainty, probably, possibly)?
Experts and the public sphere
What form of expertise is present (bureaucratic or mediated)?
To what extent is there a mediation of expertise? Are there examples of this (for example, through the mass or social media)?
How do review and writing group members deal with mixing identities (being the 'ordinary' teacher and identified 'expert')?

4.4.3 Discourses and representations

The forms of representations identified in section 3.4.2 as being particularly important to this research are representation as recontextualisation and of social actors. Here it was argued that recontextualisation is linked to transformation. van Leeuwen & Wodak (1999) identify four transformations within and between text: addition, deletion, rearrangement and substitution of elements of text as they become recontextualised. This form of analysis, as outlined in table 11, is particularly useful as it links the concepts of regulation of the Pedagogic Device to the governance of social practices present in CDA. Important in this process is the representation of 'social actors' in text

as policy actors and/or subject to policy decisions. Fairclough refers to the main social actors as being 'people' or influential groupings called 'movers' (governments, trade-unions, employee groups) (Fairclough, 2003, p.147). One such means of representation is nominalisation. Nominalisation is the process of erasing or supressing difference from text which may involve obfuscating agency (ibid, p.144). It can be employed by individuals and institutions that seek to neutralise certain phrases and labels in a way that makes them sound in the best interest of all therefore becoming acceptable and legitimate (Vellani, 2013).

Table 11: Procedures for analysing discourse. Adapted from Fairclough (2003, pp.123-155), and Woodside-Jiron (2011).

Discourse and representations
Representation as recontextualisation (transformation)
What is the emerging discourse?
Are there instances of genres of governance (e.g. policy documents) regulating other social practices?
Deletion – what elements have been deleted or backgrounded through the transformation?
Rearrangement – are elements represented in the text that have been rearranged to relate to the interests of the recontextualising field?
Substitution – are words and phrases changed as part of the transformation?
Additions – what elements have been made more prominent? what reactions of the actors involved are added to the transformed elements?
Representation of social actors in the ORF and PRF
Is there suppression or backgrounding of social actors (individuals and movers) within the text? Does this relate to their occupation of the PRF or ORF?
Are the social actors activated (makes things happen) or passivated (affected by the process)?
Are social actors represented as personal (naming them) or impersonal (dehumanizing)? Are documents authorless or are authors introduced?
To what extent is nominalisation taking place – are participants (teachers) excluded; is generalisation or abstraction taking place? Is agency obfuscated?

4.4.4 Intertextuality and assumption

Fairclough (2003) uses the term intertextuality to refer to the situation where elements of one text are incorporated with another either as direct quotation, indirect speech or as ideas. In section 3.4.4 three themes of social difference, hegemony and ideology

were introduced. These themes are now extended to include a continuum between the dialogical nature of text at one end and the suppression of text at the other based on assumption and ideology. Fairclough's five scenario continuum from intertextuality to assumption is presented as a way of approaching this form of textual analysis. This ranges from 'an exploration of difference' at the intertextuality end to a suppression of difference at the assumptive end. When texts have a negotiated existence, through a process of redrafting, there usually is apparent consensus and limited or no intertextualising. Such 'categorical assertions' (ibid, p.43) tend to be grounded in assumptions which 'bracket or suppress differences of meanings' (p.42). Hence, not only will the analysis focus on what is said but will also focus on what is unsaid and 'taken as given' (p.40). He identifies three main forms of assumptions: existential assumptions about what exists; propositional assumptions about what could or will be the case; and value assumptions about what is seen to be right. The way hegemony works is on how a view or claim, from a single interest or social group, becomes represented as universal and is maintained through the obfuscation of the interests of others. The third and final theme has an ideological focus and is connected to the first two themes insofar as it is concerned with the ideological nature of assumptions and the ideological work associated with achieving hegemony.

Table 12: Procedures for using intertextuality analysis. Adapted from Fairclough (2003, p.39-61; 2005); Taylor (2004); Woodside-Jiron (2011).

Intertextuality and assumption
What is the whole text organisation and structure including the overall narrative and argument in the text?
Social difference
Are there occurrences of intertextuality (dialogical) between texts? Or do the texts take on a negotiated existence?
Is there a recognition or attempt to acknowledge differences within the text? Or is there an attempt at consensus which excludes alternatives or suppresses?
What forms of assumptions are present within the texts (existential, propositional or value assumptions)?
Hegemony
How does the unfamiliar become familiar or 'how the particulars come to be represented as universal'?
What 'said' and 'unsaid' assumptions are made in the text (assumptions about the nature of teachers' professional knowledge)?
Are there examples of 'inculcation' – the transformation of discourse into new identities and ways of being?
Ideology
Is there an attempt to shape the 'common ground' around a particular ideological position?

Chapter 5: Making a case for change: the arguments for the reviews of teaching standards

5.1 Introduction

This chapter is the first of four analysis chapters which broadly move through the research questions from a global context of pedagogy to a local one. The focus for this chapter is to identify and assess, through the analysis of policy documents, speeches, press releases and interview data, the case made for the reviews of teaching standards in England and Scotland.

Codd (2007, p.170) identifies discrete functions of policy researchers and policy makers with the documents themselves seen as a 'vehicle of communication'. This chapter will look at both the documents associated with the wider policy making and those informing the development of the teaching standards in England and Scotland. These will be deconstructed using the combined theoretical lens of the Pedagogic Device (Bernstein, 2000) and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) (Fairclough, 2003) introduced in section 4.4.

In making the case for the reviews of teaching standards it was deemed necessary by the UK Government in England and the Scottish Government to present a clear rationale. Also, if there was to be consent from teachers (c.f. p.41) for the reviews to take place, the ownership of the standards, or perceived ownership, would be of crucial importance. On this latter point, Sachs is clear:

> Importantly, any set of professional standards for teaching needs to be owned and overseen by the profession itself. These standards should not be seen as a government-imposed regulatory framework, which promotes one particular view of teaching and what it means to be a teacher. Furthermore, it will take time to develop such standards so that they not only have currency among teachers, but the broader society itself (Sachs, 2003b, p.185).

According to Sachs, 'currency' is to be sought with both teachers and the wider society. This in itself is rooted in a conception of teaching that presupposes a self-governing profession with responsibility for developing teaching standards and maintaining a quality of teaching, and as a consequence, upholding the societal trust in the profession. However, there is no evidence to suggest that the wider society takes an interest in teaching standards with most research focusing on their use in schools (DfE, 2014). This suggests that the key audience for teaching standards are those who use them; namely, teachers and other associated professionals.

In making this case, a number of different discourses are brought together to start the process of forming the pedagogic discourse of the reviews. Bernstein identifies pedagogic discourse as composing of a dominant regulatory discourse, which he claims is dominant due to it being a '*moral* discourse' (Bernstein, 2000, p.36, italics original), and an instructional discourse (skills and competences) (c.f. p.36). Being mindful that the two discourses are interrelated, at this early stage in the development of teaching standards it is important to identify the 'moral' regulatory discourse as it goes on to dominate the instructional discourse. This will have a particular focus on genres and actions (c.f. p.60). Such an analysis requires analysis of the arguments (Toulmin's (1988) analysis of arguments[11]) presented and justifications sought in making the case for the reviews.

5.2 England: towards a performance orientation for teachers

In England the first official announcement to review the existing *Professional Standards for Teachers* (TDA, 2007) appeared in *The Importance of Teaching: The Schools White Paper* (herein referred to as the White Paper) (DfE, 2010b) released on 24th November 2010 by the Department for Education (DfE). Hulme & Menter (2011) identified a neo-liberal market-based 'organising principle' within the White Paper which included the intention to formally abolish the General Teaching Council for England[12] (GTC England), to reduce the total number of teaching standards and to develop standards of both performance and conduct (DfE, 2010b, p.25). Ellis and Orchard considered the White Paper as not a particular departure from what had happened under New Labour as the policies conformed to 'a particular economic world-view' (V. Ellis & Orchard, 2014, p.63).

In making the case for a review of teaching standards, the White Paper described the perceived inadequacies of the existing *Professional Standards for Teachers* (TDA, 2007) and stated a necessity for standards to assess 'teacher performance' and 'steer professional development' (DfE, 2010b, p.25). However, probably the most contentious move was to combine a code of conduct for teachers with teaching standards.

---

[11] A shorthand notation will be used to indicate where this form of analysis: claim (C), warrant (W), backing (B), rebuttal (R) and qualifier (Q).

[12] Historically, teachers in England have had several failed attempts at forming a regulatory body. The GTC England was set up under New Labour in 2000 and officially closed in 2012. The GTC England never had a policy remit to develop teaching standards as this was retained by the Government's Teacher Training Agency (TTA), which then became known as the Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA). The GTC England's responsibilities included the registering of teachers in England, the development of the *Code of Conduct and Practice for Registered Teachers* (GTCE, 2009) and carrying out disciplinary hearings for teachers.

In effect, the new *Teachers' Standards* (DfE, 2012b, herein referred to as the TS) were intended to be a framework which standardised teacher performance characteristics, indicated avenues for professional development and served as a regulatory framework for professional conduct.

5.2.1 'Continuously improving'

On 11th March 2011, the UK Government's Secretary of State for Education announced the *Independent Review of Teachers' Standards* (herein referred to as the Review) to review the 'key skills that teachers need to improve students' performance' (DfE, 2011d). The then Secretary of State, Michael Gove MP, presented the argument for the Review as follows:

> We already have the best generation of teachers we've ever had working in our schools. But the progress being made by other nations to improve their education systems means that we need to redouble our efforts to transform our schools. We are already expanding Teach First and focussing our reforms on attracting the best graduates into our schools. But we need to make sure that those already in the classroom are continuously improving. Headteachers and teachers have told me in no uncertain terms that the current teachers' standards are ineffective, meaningless and muddy, fluffy concepts. There is also no clear evidence that they help to improve standards. That's why we need clear standards that teachers can use to guide their development. I am delighted that one of the best headteachers in the country, Sally Coates, who has made it her mission to transform schools, has agreed to lead the Review.
>
> Michael Gove quote from a DfE press release: *Major overhaul of qualifications to raise the standard of teaching*, 11th March 2011 (DfE, 2011d).

This quote introduces the notion of reviewing the existing teaching standards based on the perceived improvement of other education systems and inadequacies of the existing standards. First, Gove starts by identifying with the audience (wider society) by using the term 'we' in acclaiming the 'best generation of teachers'. This then moves to 'we' as the Government or DfE when he says 'we' are 'focusing or reforms'. Finally, this moves to 'I' in the last sentence when introducing the idea of appointing the Review Chair. What is shown is Gove adopting 'mixed identities' (Fairclough, 2003, p.181), from Gove the 'citizen' to 'politician' to 'decision maker', as he seeks to move the regulatory discourse to one of 'continuously improving'.

In seeking to do this he says: 'progress by other nations' results in a call to 'redouble our efforts to transform our schools', which conveys a strong sense of commitment, including reviewing the existing teaching standards (C). The implication is that other

countries are improving their education systems at a faster rate (W) than England. This means that 'those already in the classroom' (by inference teachers), need to be 'continuously improving' (C). The backing for such a claim is through a system of international comparisons, presented in the Government's *The Case for Change* (DfE, 2010a), which centre on the PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment) rankings compiled by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (B). The fact that such status is placed on PISA rankings by the UK Government underlines their economic aims for education in England. This concept is explored more in section 5.2.2.

The middle part of the quote seeks to address the perceived deficit in the existing *Professional Standards for Teachers* (C). The warrant for the claim is that the existing teaching standards are not aligned with the needs of the nation's schools (W). The backing provided for the need for change is twofold. First, there is the notion that there is no clear evidence that the current set of hierarchical standards lead to improved teaching (B). Second, an unidentified group of head-teachers and teachers have condemned the existing standards as not fit for purpose (B). This backing falls short of providing 'a categorical statement of fact' in support of the warrant (Toulmin, 1988, p.105) in so far as there is no clear evidence that any set of teaching standards have ever led to 'improved' teaching and the number of head-teachers and teachers expressing this view was not stated. In fact, serving head-teachers were part of the TDA (Training and Development Agency for Schools) Board which approved the existing set of standards in 2006 (Nunn, 2008, p.107). These arguments are reviewed in more detail in section 5.2.3.

The final part of the quote further seeks to move from a position of justification for the Review to one of legitimisation and, at the same time, introduce one of the key players. Through publically stating that the Review will be led by a prominent head-teacher, Gove seeks to depoliticise the Review and to disassociate it from the Government (C) with the intention for the TS to have a far wider acceptance. This is significant in two regards, first, it suggests that the Review was to be handled in a politically-free way, and second, its leader confers a form of legitimacy by virtue of having expert authority (van Leeuwen, 2007) (W). The backing for this was the fact that the Review would be chaired by an (independent) leading head-teacher (B). However, the Review Chair had been publically praised by the Secretary of State (Gove, 2010) and addressed the Conservative Party Conference on 4th October 2011 (BurlingtonDanes1699, 2011) expressing views aligned with the thrust of Government policy, calling into question the claims to independence around her appointment. This legitimisation strategy is explored in more detail in section 5.2.4.

5.2.2 Redoubling our efforts: the 'economy of performance'

In attempting to understand the arguments for conducting the Review, one must first understand the nature of the English policy landscape and its embrace of globalisation (c.f. p.24). The associated policy solutions, for identified problems, have included a performance culture for teachers or an 'economy of performance' (Stronach, Corbin et al., 2002). This orientation was well signposted in speeches made by the Secretary of State soon after the coalition Government came to power in 2010:

> Look at the highest performing nations in any measure of educational achievement and they are always, but always, those with the most highly qualified teachers. Whether it's Singapore, South Korea or Finland, as Sir Michael Barber has pointed out in his ground-breaking study for McKinsey nothing matters more in education than attracting the best people into teaching and making sure that every minute in the classroom is spent with children benefiting from the best possible instruction.
>
> Michael Gove speech to the *National College for Leadership of Schools and Children's Services*[13] (NCSL) Annual Conference 2010 (Gove, 2010).

Bernstein (1996, p.68) makes quite a clear distinction between competence, which he links to the change and development of consciousness, and performance, which he links to economy. The intention identified in this speech is to move away from a competence model, characterised by previous sets of standards, to a performance one.

Sir Michael Barber, former head of the Prime Minister's Delivery Unit (PMDU) under Tony Blair and, subsequent to that, a director with consultancy firm McKinsey & Company, has become a particular standard bearer for comparing national school systems and for educational policy travelling (Ozga, 2005b). Andreas Schleicher, former Chair of the OCED, in his forward to Barber's 'ground-breaking study' on school systems by McKinsey & Company, referred to by Gove, makes explicit the link between education and economic output:

> The capacity of countries – both the world's most advanced economies as well as those experiencing rapid development – to compete in the global knowledge economy increasingly depends on whether they can meet fast-growing demand for high-level skills. This, in turn, hinges on significant improvements in the quality of schooling outcomes and a more equitable distribution in learning opportunities.

[13] The National College for Leadership of Schools and Children's Service (known as the National College for School Leadership up to 1st September 2009 and from 1st June 2001), subsequently became an executive agency of the Government and renamed as the National College for Teaching and Leadership (NCTL) on 1st April 2011.

> Extract for the forward to *How the world's best-performing school systems come out on top* (McKinsey & Company report) written by Andreas Schleicher (Barber & Mourshed, 2007, p.6).

This opening section sets the tone for the rest of the report in that it aligns the outcome of the individual with the economic success of the country. Coffield (2012) criticises the McKinsey Report for, amongst other things, methodological flaws, the reliance on a thin evidence base, and the use of technocratic and authoritarian language.

To a certain extent, there is genre mixing present in the McKinsey Report in so far as it is a comparative study on education systems and then becomes a 'guiding principle for developing education policy'. However, its influence permeated through political speeches and onto the Review in England (c.f. p.25). Reference was made to it in the opening paragraph of Dame Sally Coates' (Chair of the Review) introduction to the Review's First Interim Report (DfE, 2011a):

> The conclusion of Sir Michael Barber's seminal study of the world's best performing school systems has fast become a guiding principle for developing education policy: "the quality of an education system cannot exceed the quality of its teachers".
>
> Opening sentence to the forward by Sally Coates (Chair of the Review) to the *First Report of the Independent Review of Teachers' Standards* (DfE, 2011a, p.3).

These three extracts above (a genre chain) illustrate how economic themes have moved from Michael Baber's report to the *First report of the Independent Review of Teachers' Standards* (DfE, 2011a) via strong framing from Government (Michael Gove's speech to the NCSL).

Despite the different forms of documents from which these three extracts were retrieved, they all adopt a similar narrative and generalised genre. The message and claim is strong: there needs to be the best teachers giving the best instruction, which by implication we do not currently have, hence the need for reform (C). The warrant is quite clear – that a nation's education system, when compared against other education systems, is only as 'productive' as the quality of its teachers (W). The backing provided, through the McKinsey study, is an analysis of those nation's education systems, and their policy 'solutions', that are higher in the international rankings (B).

There is a clear argument for 'continuous improvement' linking through the different extracts from the global to the national context. Fairclough (2003) identifies this as a facet of globalisation as change is administered at a distance through a genre chain. This has been characterised as 'soft governance' (Knodel, Windzio et al., 2014) with

the global becoming increasingly influential on the local scene with policy 'borrowing' (Phillips, 2015) or 'travelling' (Ozga & Jones, 2006) seen as the norm.

5.2.3 Simplifying the existing Professional Standards for Teachers

Through the White Paper and a press release from the DfE (DfE, 2011d), it was clearly signalled that there was a desire for radical change to the existing *Professional Standards for Teachers*. This was to take two main forms. First, there was a strong indication that the new standards for entry to the profession (those seeking Qualified Teacher Status[14]) should be simplified; and second, the hierarchical structure of the existing standards around career progression should be dismantled. In seeking to justify such a move, the perceived inadequacies of the existing standards were highlighted:

> The current bureaucratic standards are expected to be replaced from September 2012.
>
> The current standards include:
>
> - 33 standards a trainee teacher must meet in order to qualify for Qualified Teacher Status (QTS). Three are focused on how to "communicate effectively" and "have a commitment to collaboration and co-operative working". Only two standards are explicitly about skills on how to teach effectively
> - 120 pages of guidance to go with the QTS standards that trainee teachers are expected to follow
> - a total of 102 standards teachers must meet across all levels. There are four core standards on 'health and wellbeing'. Just two are on making sure they have a good 'subject and curriculum knowledge'.
>
> Extract from a DfE press release *Major overhaul of qualifications to raise the standard of teaching* on the launch of the Review, 11th March 2011 (DfE, 2011d).

The first part of this extract identifies the existing standards as 'bureaucratic', as something that is undesirable. By inference, the 'policy actors' (c.f. p.43) of the previous review group (Nunn, 2008) are 'impersonalised' (Fairclough, 2003) as being overly concerned with bureaucratic procedures. Within the first bullet point the notion that teachers' professional knowledge is something that could be socially constructed is dismissed and there is a propositional assumption about the nature of effective teaching. This bullet point attempts to shape common ground around the notion that teaching is an individual enterprise; the teacher and thirty children in a classroom. Hence, no 'commitment to collaboration' is necessary.

[14] Qualified Teacher Status is the government-administered entry qualification for teachers in England.

Concealed beneath the rhetorical nature of the press release was a clear move to eradicate two mainstays of the New Labour's policy agenda set out in the 2007 standards: Namely, the concept of school workforce reform centred on agencies working collaboratively and the policy initiatives centred around Every Child Matters (HM Treasury, 2003).

A key player in the development of the 2007 standards, but excluded from the TS (DfE, 2012b) review process, thought the criticisms levelled at the existing standards unfair and the new minimalist approach an oversimplification:

> I think, quite unfairly, that this [2007 standards] was represented as some cumbersome body of standards and that they were over verbose … we spent a lot of time sitting around in darkened rooms trying to work out how you express progression, those adverbs … how do you express ways of doing something better? Stronger, deeper, whatever; it's very hard to do. But there was a conscientious attempt to do that and I think that Gove and the new coalition administration went with their headline notion of reducing bureaucracy; had this idea of coming up with something that was very slim, which they've done – eight standards. My own view is that's problematic because the Teaching Standards represent something that is sometimes complex, complicated and problematic and sometimes you do the profession a disservice by oversimplifying things.
>
> Interview 3 (England).

In contrast, a head-teacher member of the Review identified repetition in the existing *Professional Standards for Teachers*:

> …and when we had looked at those [2007] standards in the first few meetings, and read them really closely, we realised that a lot of the differences were in the qualifying adverbs and adjectives that were used. So, you did something in the first set of standards, you did it very well in the second set of standards. We felt that there was a lot of replication and a lot of standards that were quite meaningless.
>
> Interview 4 (England).

A conclusion drawn here was that, if the higher-level standards (standards for more experienced teachers) were just an articulation of the entry level standards but with more superlatives, then perhaps there was not a need for higher-level standards at all. The assumption being that a reduced set of standards would be perfectly adequate and provide more clarity, or certainty, for those who use them in schools.

This simplification of the TS appeals to the ideas that it is advantageous to reduce the complexity of the standards and to do so is simply making them accessible to more people. Within this discourse there is little room for recognising teaching as a complex

endeavour or an acknowledgement that teachers require sophisticated sets of standards.

This simplifying theme was carried through into the Review. The Deputy Chair of the Review and Chair of the Drafting Group, Roy Blatchford, outlined his intent for the review in his book published after the release of the TS:

> In essence, the Standards had to raise the bar and highlight the characteristics of good teaching. Above all, the Standards needed to be clear, simple and assessable, and identify the key elements of teaching, and expectations of professional conduct that underpin the practice of teachers at all career stages.
>
> Extract from *The 2012 Teachers' Standards in the Classroom* authored by Roy Blatchford (Blatchford, 2013, p.3).

The claim here is that it was a necessity to simplify the TS and make them more accessible. There is strong commitment here where the term 'needed' is used to convey a sense of requirement. The implicit justification is that by representing teaching as something uncomplicated it is appealing to efficiency (W), and therefore, it is logical to take a reductive stance towards developing the standards.

This debate was held against the backdrop of Government attempts to cut 'red tape' or regulation. The reductive concept had become normalised and part of everyday thinking (Hall & O'Shea, 2013); complexity is problematic, 'simpler' is unproblematic. The TS are seen as part of that system. However, there was no clear rationale, based on teachers' professional knowledge, for a reduced set of standards. The belief was that a simpler set of standards would make it easier to appraise teachers and reduce the barriers to entry into the profession.

5.2.4 The 'expert' as a legitimisation device

Alongside the justifications provided for the Review, the DfE sought to strengthen the notion that it was to be carried out at arm's length from Government. This included its name – *Independent Review of Teachers' Standards* – and its leadership by a group of identified 'experts'. When this information was introduced there were attempts to personalise and promote those involved by referring to them as 'excellent head-teachers' and 'excellent practitioners':

> The review will be led by excellent head teachers and teachers.
>
> Extract from *The Schools White Paper* (DfE, 2010b, p.25).
>
> The review will be led by Sally Coates, the outstanding Principal at Burlington Danes Academy in London. Other

> excellent headteachers, teachers and education experts will sit on the review.
>
> Extract from a DfE press release – *Major overhaul of qualifications to raise the standard of teaching*, 11th March 2011 (DfE, 2011d).
>
> The Review Chair will be supported by a small group of excellent practitioners – including head teachers, teachers and initial teacher training providers.
>
> Extract for the *Terms of Reference for the Review of Teachers' Standards* (DfE, 2011g).

The information being presented here, and one that the DfE wishes to become familiar to the reader, is the idea that the Review is independent from Government, and therefore, more likely to have consent from teachers. Such moves are attempts at gaining legitimacy and acceptance for the Review by virtue of expert authority (van Leeuwen, 2007). The use of clauses helps to support this form of authority: 'the outstanding Principal', 'excellent practitioners'.

However, the nominalisation, the information the author wishes to become familiar, of this claim means that there are unchallenged assumptions associated with the setting up of the Review. These assumptions include the validity of the claim to expertise and the role of the DfE in act as the organising institution for such an event (see section 7.2 for a more detailed analysis of the latter). This is despite Sachs' (2003b, p.185) insistance that they should be 'be owned and overseen by the profession itself'.

In contrast to the review for the 2007 standards, where three teacher educators from higher education formed part of the writing group[15], the Review sought to marginalise mainstream university schools of education. The Review did have representation from Teach First, an educational charity aimed at attracting graduates from prestigious universities into teaching; and the private University of Buckingham. Neither of these two institutions are members of UCET (Universities' Council for the Education of Teachers), the universities' teacher education organisation and lobby group that represents the vast majority of higher education teacher education providers. This apparent underrepresentation of the initial teacher education sector was outlined in a letter to the Secretary of State from UCET:

> We are, however, concerned about the under representation of the teacher education sector on the review group. Colleagues from Teach First and the University of

[15] The write group for the 2007 standards met between 22nd and 24th November 2005 and composed five TDA and two DfES officials; three union representatives; head teachers and teachers nominated by the Specialist Schools and Academies Trust; representatives from English, mathematics and science subject associations and three HEI teacher educators (J. Nunn 2008).

> Buckingham will be able to offer valuable perspectives derived from their small-scale specialist provision, however for the outcomes of the review to have the widest possible impact it is essential that representatives of high quality mainstream teacher education sector are involved at the earliest opportunity.
>
> Extract from UCET letter to Rt. Hon Michael Gove MP, Secretary of State for Education, 16th March 2011 (UCET, 2011).

By expressing concern about the non-involvement of the university sector (W) and through characterising Teach First and the University of Buckingham as sitting outside the mainstream (B), it is claimed that the Review, and subsequent TS, will not have the 'impact' desired of them (C). In response, Minister for Schools tasked with overseeing the Review process, simply restated what had previously been published in the White Paper:

> I recognise your concerns that the Review should engage with the teacher education sector. The Secretary of State's intention, as set out in the White Paper, *The Importance of Teaching*, is for this Review to be led primarily by head teachers and teachers, with the support of a number of other education experts.
>
> Extract from the response of Nick Gibb MP, Minister for Schools, to UCET, 19th April 2011 (DfE, 2011c).

There were no rebuttals of the argument presented by UCET nor was there qualifications to the original arguments presented by the DfE. The Minister chose not to engage with the argument presented by UCET other than to acknowledge that it existed. He reiterates what had been previously published in the White Paper and, at the same time, reinforces what he wishes to become familiar to all: that (Government selected) teachers and head-teachers are best placed to carry out this work; and that the Government determines who experts in the field of education are.

What has been identified here is the contested nature of the appointments to the Review. There will be an examination of the Review's approach to the drafting of the TS in Chapter 6.

5.3 Scotland: a 'reconceptualised model' for teacher professionalism

On the publication of *Teaching Scotland's Future* (Donaldson, 2011) (herein referred to as the TSF) in January 2011, the report and its 50 recommendations, including those relating to the revision of the existing *Professional Standards for Teachers* (2006b; c; 2002) (herein referred to as the PST), stood as a colossus of Scottish education policy. Although it is not entirely clear what the impetus for this wholesale review of teacher education in Scotland was or where it came from (Menter & Hulme, 2011), it was

commissioned by Fiona Hyslop, the then Cabinet Secretary for Education, and launched with a wide-ranging remit in late 2009.

This review was led by the newly retired Senior Chief Inspector at Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education (HMIe), Graham Donaldson. Donaldson taught history in Glasgow and Dunbartonshire and then worked for several different institutions within Scottish education, including 27 years at the Scottish inspectorate. He retired in 2010 and subsequently became an educational consultant which has included working for the OECD (Donaldson, 2015b). Through his report and recommendations, Donaldson argued for a 'reconceptualised model for teacher professionalism' (Donaldson, 2011, p.68) in Scotland.

TSF was enthusiastically received by the Scottish Government, including a complimentary reference in the 2011 Scottish National Party Manifesto (SNP, 2011)[16], and by many educational institutions in Scotland (Hulme & Menter, 2011). A National Partnership Group (NPG) (Scottish Government, 2012b), consisting of representatives from the full range of Scottish educational institutions, was set up to look at how the recommendation from TSF could be implemented. They gave TSF a favourable reading and agreed with its recommendations with very little alteration. These included the recommendation that the revision of the PST be carried out by the General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTC Scotland).

Not everyone agreed with the report and its recommendations. Criticism of TSF included the apparent muddled conception of teacher professionalism and doubts about how the competing educational institutions in Scotland would implement the recommendations (O'Brien, 2012). S. MacDonald (2013) points to the influence of the OECD as a clear indication that the report aimed to align Scottish education with dominant neo-liberal ideas and economic growth. The OECD had previously praised Scotland's approach to teacher induction and its qualification for headship (OECD 2007a) and went onto describe the revised PST as 'an inspiring set of professional standards' (OECD, 2015, p.17).

A teacher interviewed as part of this research did suggest that the Scottish educational policy scene adopted TSF uncritically and that this was out of touch with mainstream teachers:

> I think that it [TSF] had a significant influence amongst the key players in Scottish education in terms of organisation

[16] Donaldson had consulted with opposition politicians during the writing of the report and the continuity of its recommendations was assured by all the mainstream political parties (Donaldson, 2015a).

> and individuals because, it is a small body of folk that have been involved in Donaldson through working groups to the new standards. There's no doubt about it that the same faces do crop up regularly, although there's always renewal and refreshing around the edges. So, from my experience over the last six years or so, Donaldson has been repeatedly brought up as justification for the development of initiatives and programmes and subsequent policies but it's by people who are very fundamental to the education system in Scotland but not actually working at the chalk-face.
>
> Interview 5 (Scotland).

The interview extract impersonalises 'the key players' (policy actors) as a 'small body of folk' to caricature them as a 'policy elite' (Christie, 2003). This view was not one shared by other individuals interviewed as part of the research. The other interviewees indicated a strong sense of policy consensus amongst Scottish educational institutions identified by Ozga & Lingard (2007, p.73) as the 'collective narrative' (see section 6.3.1, c.f. p.96).

Given this background information, it would be reasonable to suggest that the revision of the PST developed from a policy narrative influenced by the OECD and Graham Donaldson. The 'recontextualised model' was received by the leading educational institutions in Scotland. What remains to be identified is the case made for the revision of the PST.

5.3.1 The dominance of Donaldson: challenging previous 'certainties'?

In seeking to justify the 50 recommendations, TSF adopts a pragmatic stance towards globalisation and its economic implications. Traditionally Scottish education had performed relatively well in international performance tables (OECD, 2007b) and, in arriving at his conclusions, Donaldson acknowledges international evidence including from the OECD (OECD, 2007a) and the McKinsey & Company report (Barber & Mourshed, 2007) heavily cited in England. The importance of such evidence is drawn to the reader's attention in the first (overview) chapter of TSF:

> Evidence of relative performance internationally has become a key driver of policy. That evidence suggests, perhaps unsurprisingly, that the foundations of successful education lie in the quality of teachers and their leadership. High quality people achieve high quality outcomes for children.
>
> Extract from the introduction to *Teaching Scotland's Future* (Donaldson, 2011, p.7).

Through this extract, Donaldson wishes the reader to strongly link 'outcomes for children' to the quality of 'school teachers and leadership' (C). The use of the term 'outcomes for children' speaks to characterising outcomes not solely in economic

terms. This is consistent with Scottish education being traditionally seen as an entitlement (Ozga & Lingard, 2007) grounded in ethical and values systems (Donaldson, 2015a).

The second part of the extract above refers to 'teachers' as opposed to 'teaching' – it is the individual not the activity that makes the difference (W). The backing for the claim comes from international comparisons (B), particularly those compiled by the OECD. Donaldson, when referring to the international 'evidence', uses terms such as 'suggest' (Q) and is less forthright than the pronouncements from the DfE in England. He opens the possibility that there could be alternative interpretations of the international evidence.

Donaldson appears to accept the forces of globalisation influencing educational policy for economic purposes while, at the same time, embracing the need for Scotland's teachers to adapt to changing circumstances, particularly those brought about by technological advances (Donaldson, 2015a). He frames this as globalisation challenging previous 'certainties':

> Why do we need continuous improvement in education?
>
> Because of:
>
> - the central importance of education to individual, social, democratic and economic wellbeing.
> - the nature, extent and pace of change, particularly driven by technological innovation.
> - globalisation challenging previous 'certainties'.
>
> Extract form Graham Donaldson's presentation to the *Holyrood Conference* (Donaldson, 2012, speech marks original).

This extract, from a presentation given by Donaldson shortly after the release of TSF, is dialogical in so far at it poses a question but, he attempts to frame the argument around a value assumption that, as in England, 'continuous improvement' is necessary. His characterisation of the status-quo as previous 'certainties' challenged by globalisation is the way of explaining and justifying the need for 'change' (W). However, his interpretations of this, in terms of policy 'solutions', are quite different to the ones proposed in England.

Despite the accession to the forces of globalisation, Donaldson steers clear of the simple view of teaching adopted in England and recognises it as a complex endeavour as part of his 'reconceptualised model' proposed in TSF. This proposition sought to be grounded in evidence-based policy making. For example, it drew on a commissioned literature review, *Literature Review on Teacher Education in the 21st Century* (Menter, Hulme et al., 2010), carried out by the University of Glasgow.

Through both TSF, and the accompanying literature review, there was a desire for teachers to move closer to Hoyle's (1974) 'extended professionality' (c.f. p.24) characterised by engagement with educational research, reflective practice and professional learning communities as he argued in the report:

> There is an urgent need to challenge the narrow interpretations of the teacher's role which have created unhelpful philosophical and structural divides … There is currently an over-emphasis on preparation for the first post and less focus upon the potential of the initial and early period of a teacher's career to develop the values, skills and understandings which will provide the basis of career-long growth … Teachers should see themselves as educators not just of the young people in their charge but of their colleagues locally, nationally and internationally. The implications of this 'extended professionalism' are taken forward throughout the report in relation to a teacher's developing career.
>
> Extract from *Teaching Scotland's Future* (Donaldson, 2011, p.5).

This response to the forces of globalisation is for an 'urgent need' to 'extend' the teacher workforce with 'career-long growth'. As in England, the language used is one of urgency and immediate change. However, in contrast to England, there is little appetite for reducing the scope of teachers' professional knowledge to a set of performance indicators. Teaching is very much seen as a life-long career and the professional structures, including the professional institutions and standards, need to reflect this.

5.3.2 The 'reconceptualised' model

TSF builds on *Curriculum for Excellence* (Scottish Executive, 2004) to provide an alternative conception of what it is to be a teacher in Scotland. The case is made, based on the literature review (Menter, Hulme et al., 2010), for a version of Hoyle's extended professionality' (Hoyle, 1974) (C). This narrative identifies four teacher 'paradigms' (p.21-25) including the effective teacher (standards and competence), the reflective teacher, the enquiring teacher and finally the transformative teacher (c.f. p.19-24). This narrative acknowledges teaching as a complex endeavour (W) where teachers are the agents in educational change:

> In the 1970s Eric Hoyle wrote an influential paper that suggested that models of teaching existed at some point on a spectrum between 'restricted' and 'extended' versions of teacher professionalism (Hoyle, 1974). Crudely speaking the first model depicted above, the effective teacher, rests at the 'restricted' end of the spectrum, where teaching is largely defined in terms of a range of technical skills, with the other three models being at various points towards the 'extended' end of the spectrum, where teachers are seen as more

> autonomous and their own judgement is called upon to a much greater extent (Adams, 2008).
>
> Extract from *Literature Review on Teacher Education in the 21st Century* (Menter, Hulme et al., 2010, p.24).
>
> … the most successful education systems do more than seek to attain particular standards of competence and to achieve change through prescription. They invest in developing their teachers as reflective, accomplished and enquiring professionals who have the capacity to engage fully with the complexities of education and to be key actors in shaping and leading educational change.
>
> Extract from *Teaching Scotland's Future* (Donaldson, 2011, p.4).

In this second extract, Donaldson states, citing international evidence to justify his claim, that most 'successful education systems' have moved beyond competency approaches to teaching typified in Hoyle's (1974) restricted professionality. There is a recontextualisation from the academic literature review to the policy document using a similar narrative genre. This maintains the prominence of the 'extended' professional, in identifying successful teachers as reflective and enquiring, and backgrounds the 'effective teacher' favoured in England. Donaldson equates Hoyle's (1974) 'extended professionality', characterised by engagement with findings from educational research and contributions from learning communities, with his 'reconceptualised model' for teachers in Scotland.

TSF made it quite clear that the revision should not entirely change the nature of the standards being more of a revision or 'updating' than the complete rewriting undertaken in England (Menter & Hulme, 2011). He suggested that an overall standards framework should model a conception of teacher professionalism that is structured, hierarchical and extended.

Two recommendations from TSF (recommendations 35 & 36) were concerned with the revision of the PST. Through these recommendations, Donaldson provides more detail for his 'reconceptualised model':

> **Recommendation 35**
>
> The professional Standards need to be revised to create a coherent overarching framework and enhanced with practical illustrations of the Standards. This overall framework should reflect a reconceptualised model of teacher professionalism.
>
> **Recommendation 36**
>
> A new 'Standard for active registration' should be developed to clarify expectations of how fully registered teachers are expected to continue to develop their skills and competences. This standard should be challenging and

> aspirational, fully embracing enhanced professionalism for teachers in Scotland.
>
> Extract from *Teaching Scotland's Future* (Donaldson, 2011, p.97).

In justifying the inclusion of Recommendation 35, Donaldson identifies the 'problem' of a patchwork of professional standards suggesting the need for an overarching framework. In the second sentence of the recommendation, Donaldson sets out how the framework 'should' look. The use of the intermediate modalised form (Fairclough, 2003, p.168) (should) recognises the limits in the reach of the report, the consultative nature of policy formation in Scotland and the independence of the GTC Scotland. This contrasts with more affirmative and authoritarian language in England.

Recommendation 36 continues with the reconceptualised theme by proposing a new 'Standard for active registration' for those teachers beyond the initial preparatory phases and needing clarification on how to embrace enhanced professionalism. This was conceived by the GTC Scotland as the *Standard for Career-Long Professional Learning* (see section 8.3.3).

5.3.3 The fully independent GTC Scotland

The GTC Scotland was formed in 1965 (the first meeting was on 11 March 1966) and consists of the major stakeholders in Scottish education as part of a 37-member council. This includes 19 elected teacher members, 11 nominated members from, for example, church and parent organisations, and seven lay members.

Prior to the GTC Scotland becoming the world's first fully independent teaching council on 2nd April 2012, some decisions made by the Council were subject to final approval by the Scottish Government (GTCS, 2015). The GTC Scotland prides itself on being both independent from the Scottish Government and from practitioner institutions, such as teaching unions, with its main aim of upholding the public trust in the teaching profession (Finn & Hamilton, 2013). Primarily, this newfound independence endorsed powers to set entry criteria and accredit courses of initial teacher education and, importantly for this thesis, sole responsibility for the development of teaching standards in Scotland.

Previously, the suite of teaching and school leadership standards (the PST) had been developed by a mixture of Scottish education institutions including the GTC Scotland (c.f. p.29). Now, in line with the recommendations from TSF, the development of the PST was brought into ownership of the GTC Scotland.

Significantly in regards to the revision of the PST, the GTC Scotland would have the final say as one individual close to this institution identified:

> That wasn't the final stage [the Writing and Steering Groups] of course because the Council itself, the 37 members, they have to approve the standards. And, of course, in that situation, what you've got is 37 members sitting round a table representing a huge range of interests. The teacher representatives there are not strictly speaking union representatives but the unions do put up a slate of people that they would like to see elected to the GTC, so you could say that the unions are represented but as a member of council they mustn't wear a union hat, they must represent all the teachers. And, of course, you have all the other interests – the public interests as well. So the final stage in terms of this representation was, after the Writing Groups had done their work, and after the Steering Group had said 'we're happy with this' it [the revised PST] still had to go to the Full Council to see if they were happy with it and there were some last minute negotiations to seal the deal.
>
> Interview 4 (Scotland).

This negotiated form of policy development does ensure that elected teacher representatives and other stakeholders do have a say in the final text of the PST through the representative structures of the GTC Scotland. This equates to a form of bureaucratic or institutional authority (Fairclough, 2003, p.98) that is embedded in the rules and regulations of the GTC Scotland and the consultative traditions of Scottish education. These rules and regulations include the elected and representative nature of the GTC Scotland Council. Hulme and Kennedy (2016) consider such rules and regulations as exercising 'soft power'. How the structures of Scottish education regulated the writing of the PST is a focus for section 8.3.

5.4 Contrasting the case for change

The chapter started by seeking to provide the starting point for the analysis and address the first research question concerned with the identification of the case made for the reviews of teaching standards in England and Scotland. The analysis frames a recontextualisation of (pedagogic) discourse from the global to the national contexts. Although the reasons for the reviews are neither totally identifiable nor transparent, both reviews set out to contribute towards a shifting conception of what it is to be a teacher. What has been outlined here is a willingness, across the two policy contexts, to use international evidence as a basis for arguing for change. However, although both nations talk of 'continuous improvement' for teachers and international evidence is used as justification for both reviews, even some of the same evidence (Barber & Mourshed, 2007), there are some marked differences in how this is interpreted and used to shape policy.

First, both the White Paper in England, and TSF in Scotland, refer to globalisation and the relative performance of other nations' education systems. High stakes language

such as ‘redouble our efforts’ and ‘urgent need’ are used to convey the urgency with which change must happen. However, what that change should be is quite different.

The response (regulatory discourse) to this need to change is economically framed in England as follows. The world has economically changed and international comparative data suggest that certain nations are educationally falling behind. If a nation is losing the ‘race’ then teaching and teachers need to ‘continuously improve’. This leads to a call (instructional discourse) to simplify the TS.

In contrast, Donaldson in Scotland adopts a more nuanced response to the forces of globalisation (regulatory discourse) and frames them as ‘challenging previous certainties’ (Donaldson, 2012). There is an acceptance of a changing world and a sense of inevitability about globalisation. However, the interpretation of this this is quite different to England as international evidence is used to make the case for a Scottish version of ‘extended professionality’ (Hoyle, 1974) (instructional discourse).

While both nations acknowledge the ‘soft governance’ (Knodel, Windzio et al., 2014) of globalisation, in England the response is to fully embrace the performance orientated conceptions of teaching tied to the advancement of the individual. In Scotland, on the other hand, teachers are encouraged to embrace ‘extended professionalism’ (Donaldson, 2011).

In respect to addressing the existing teaching standards, the approach adopted in each context was markedly different. In England, this was through identifying them as ‘bureaucratic’ and not fit for purpose. The main justification offered for such a stance included an assessment that the status quo – the existing *Professional Standards for Teachers* – were no longer acceptable with their ‘fluffy concepts’ and focus on diversity, collaborative working and policies such as *Every Child Matters* (HM Treasury, 2003). This did not fit with the implied notion of the teacher operating individual with a class of children.

While the reforms to education in England represent an unrestrained approach to a performance orientation for teachers, policy reforms in Scotland have had a more negotiated existence. In Scotland, this ‘revision’ was an opportunity to reorder the disparate entities of the PST and shape them into a coherent overarching framework.

Having set the policy direction, the next steps were to set in motion the development of the new suites of standards. In England, this amounted to the conception of the ‘expert’ as a legitimisation device to identify the review as politically neutral.

For Scotland, the case was made by Donaldson for a realignment of teaching standards within the now fully independent GTC Scotland characterised by consensual

education policy development. This form of policy development conforms to the committee structures of Scottish education and was presented as reflecting national and cultural priorities.

All major contributors to the literature on teaching standards (Kleinhenz & Ingvarson, 2007; Sachs, 2003b; 2005) are agreed on the importance of teaching standards being owned and developed by the profession itself. In seeking to add legitimacy to the Reviews among teacher, in England there is a reliance on 'expert' authority, in Scotland this comes in an 'institutional' form. With most reviews of teaching standards convening some form of writing group to develop draft standards, Nunn (2008, p.117) recognises the membership of such groups as in England being particularly important. This is because it frames the approach taken to occupying the recontextualising field. This concept of appropriating the reviews of teaching standards will form the starting point of the next chapter.

Chapter 6: Creating the recontextualising fields of the reviews of teaching standards

6.1 Introduction

Chapter 5 started the task of analysing the series of events that go from making the case for the reviews of the teaching standards in England and Scotland to their final textual representation. This has been presented as moving from a global to national and then onto a local context of discourse. The next move is to look at the transfer from national to local in describing the process of appointments to the review groups. This will include determining the mechanisms used to make appointments to the review groups in England and Scotland, revealing the 'backstories' of the policy actors involved and identify those agents and institutions excluded from the process.

Bernstein's (2000) Pedagogic Device (c.f. p.33) provides an appropriate theoretical framework to address the inner workings of the reviews. The Device brings together an assembled framework of rules and principles in order to make sense of the communications and actions of those involved. Recontextualising rules are typically instigated by the state, and their associated institutions. For example, in chapter 5 the concepts of 'change' and 'continuous improvement' were recontextualised from the 'global' to the 'national' context. Such recontextualisation takes place in the fields of the Pedagogic Device.

The recontextualising field usually consists of a tightly controlled official recontextualising field (ORF), 'the site of policy production and the source of policy documents' (Singh, Thomas et al., 2013, p.468)', and a relatively autonomous pedagogic recontextualising field (PRF), which is prone to conflict (Singh, 2002) particularly when holding opposing positions to that of the ORF. In England, the UK Government, within the state school system, has extended its influence over a narrow ORF and weakened the PRF. Whereas in Scotland, the Scottish Government has opened up the ORF to the range of Scottish educational institutions, including the now fully independent General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTC Scotland).

For those individuals involved in the development of teaching standards, Judyth Sachs (2005, p.6) identifies two distinct challenges. These include accommodating the 'ambiguities and uncertainties' of political agendas for education and interpreting the nature of teacher professionalism. In addition to these two challenges, a third challenge needs to be introduced which is associated with the ideological identities brought to reviews by policy actors.

Bernstein (2000, p.115) is clear in identifying pedagogic discourse as a collection of rules and principles that are brought together in the recontextualising field through ideological 'screens'. In a similar way, Fairclough (2003) refers to individuals and institutions adopting identities in text. It is the task of this chapter to determine the nature of those ideological screens brought to the reviews in England and Scotland by policy actors.

6.2 The *Independent Review of Teachers' Standards* in England

In his analysis of the 2007 *Professional Standards for Teachers* (TDA, 2007) Beck (2009) identifies the diminishing influence of the PRF, and particularly the voice of higher education, and the promotion of the ORF as determining the forms of teachers' professional knowledge presented in the text. He identifies this as an example of Bernstein's (1996) 'totally pedagogised society' where increasing number of occupational activities are being subjected to pedagogic interventions.

By 2010 the new coalition Government had signalled their desire for these existing standards to be reduced in scope and size and, as argued in Chapter 5 (c.f. p.70), for teachers to be intertwined with the 'economy of performance' (Stronach, Corbin et al., 2002). Within a year of the release of *The Importance of Teaching: The Schools White Paper* (DfE, 2010b) there was a Government appointed *Independent Review of Teachers' Standards* (herein known as the Review) in place.

The names of the 15 Review members (appendix 4), together with short biographies, were issued by the Department for Education (DfE) on 11th March 2011 accompanying a press release announcing the commencement of the Review. The Review was presented as being representative of schools, in the form of head-teachers, accompanied by identified 'experts', with a key legitimising concept being that schools should be at the centre of developing the *Teachers' Standards* (herein referred to as TS). However, a closer examination of the Review identified the notable absence of several institutions who formed part of the corresponding process for the 2007 teaching standards, including teaching unions and university education departments (c.f. p.75).

Based on documents written by individuals and institutions of the recontextualising field (table 4, p.47) and the interview transcripts of the policy actors (table 7, p.53), this section will now explore the appointment process to the Review before interpreting the 'identities' and ideological 'screens' of those involved.

6.2.1 Selecting the Review Group: insulating the ORF from the PRF

The DfE appointed Review Chair, Dame Sally Coates, then Principal of Burlington Danes Academy in London, was credited with greatly improving the GCSE results at

that school and was a known supporter of Government policy (c.f. p.74). The interview data suggested that she was well-respected within the Review and chaired it with much skill.

Of the other Review members, five were either existing head-teachers or principals, two were practising teachers from the ARK academy chain (there was no teacher representation from local authority or voluntary aided schools); the Chief Executive of Harris Academies and Roy Blatchford, the Director of the National Education Trust, an education think tank. Additionally, there were representatives from the Independent Schools Council, Professor Anthony O'Hear from the private University of Buckingham, who was a Government special advisor to the governments of Margaret Thatcher and John Major and a prominent figure of the New Right (N. Lunt et al., 1993; O'Hear, 1988); and Brett Wigdortz, Chief Executive of Teach First which he launched after working for McKinsey & Company.

A formal rationale explaining how Review members were selected was not issued by the DfE, however, as one head-teacher member identified, it was a DfE appointed group:

> You get these positions by being asked by Ministers – you don't apply or anything like that. Review groups, although they're independent, obviously, the Department for Education have people they select … and they ask them to do, to hold various positions and to join review groups.
>
> Interview 4 (England).

There is a hegemonic element to this extract in the use of the word 'obviously'. This conveys a sense of familiarity with the information being presented: that the DfE should naturally be involved in selecting people for reviews.

Although the Review members were selected by officials at the DfE, this process appeared to be subject to a ministerial veto by, the Minister for Schools at the time, Nick Gibb MP. As one former Government advisor described:

> …as usual with these things, the civil servants put together a longlist of people who could all do it, and the Minister said 'no to this person, no to this person, yes to this person'.
>
> Interview 5 (England).

This extract identifies a significant recontextualising principle used to map out the recontextualising field through the selection of the Review members. This involved firstly the filter of a 'longlist' being drawn up by officials and then the Minster having a veto over the final selections. The fact that the Minister handpicked the members of the Review, and that there were significant omissions from the teaching unions, local

authorities and university departments of education (the PRF), indicates the development of a strongly insulated ORF.

In the first Review meeting, a group consisting of six Review members was selected to form the Drafting Group. The places on the Drafting Group were filled by several of the identified 'experts' including Roy Blatchford, Drafting Group Chair, Professor O'Hear, well known for his disapproval of formal preparation for teachers, and John McIntosh, former headmaster at The London Oratory School[17] for 29 years up until 2006. The remaining places were filled by a primary and secondary head-teacher, and a secondary teacher. The Drafting Group was responsible for writing drafts of the TS text between the main Review Group meetings. As one head-teacher member of the Drafting Group pointed out, this group had a significant role in shaping the text of the TS:

> The Drafting Group would go away and put intensive thought, discussion and consideration to where we were at. And all of that information was fed back – recommendations, the rationale for the recommendations – to the full group.
>
> Interview 2 (England).

This extract identifies the Drafting Group as the key policy actors in the ORF as they translated much of the pedagogic discourse into text.

The overriding view of the Review members interviewed as part of this research was that the group drew from a broad section of the educational community:

> …looking round the room 'okay they're ITT [initial teacher training], that's a group of academies, that's Teach First, that's a practitioner, that's a head, that's a ... we've pretty much got everybody there. That was just about manageable in terms of having meaningful discussion. That's the thing – you wanted enough people to get the expertise.
>
> Interview 1 (England).
>
> There were three or four, again I can't quite remember … other head-teachers on it. There were also two teachers, who weren't heads but ordinary teachers, one from primary and one from secondary. So, there was a primary head, a special school head … maybe two primary heads, two secondary heads and one teacher from secondary and one teacher from primary, somebody from private education and somebody from higher education. So, it was pretty representative.
>
> Interview 4 (England).

[17] The London Oratory is a Roman Catholic day school in London. A number of prominent politicians, including Tony Blair, have sent their children to the school.

First, there is a certain degree of identity mixing in these extracts. On the one hand, being an 'ordinary' teacher and, on the other, bringing some form of expertise to the Review.

Second, there is a value assumption as the Review members identified themselves as being representative of the wider education sector. There is clear justification provided by the interviewees for this view in the form of a list of different institutions represented. However, this necessitates either a naivety associated with what constitutes the education sector as a whole or a deliberate backgrounding of certain institutions including teacher and head teacher unions, teachers from local authority schools and representation from mainstream initial teacher education[18], all of whom formed part of the clearly defined PRF.

It can be argued that the Review represented a grouping within education that was sympathetic to the thrust of Government policy. This was very much the view expressed by a member of the PRF:

> I would say it was a narrow representation in terms of the teachers that were on that, the independent schools were there, Brett was there from Teach First … but it was significantly around the teachers who were in particular types of schools – academy schools, independent sector had a strong representation, John McIntosh was there ... certainly it's representative of schools, there were a lot of schools there; arguably you could say it was a particular subset of schools.
>
> Interview 3 (England).

This perspective, from a position within the PRF, sharply contrasts with the views expressed above by the two Review members. The individuals on the Review were personalised, for example, 'Brett from Teach First' which indicates that at least some of the identified 'experts' were known figures within education.

What is undisputed is that head-teachers made up a significant proportion of the Review, however, what is disputed is the representative sample of those head-teachers and the lack of practising teachers, particularly from non-academy schools. It is quite clear that the DfE exercised quite a large amount of control over both the type of institutions represented and the individuals involved. For example, two of the head-teachers had previously been mentioned as admired by the Secretary of State for Education in speeches (Gove 2010); additionally, the two teachers on the Review

[18] Teach First, a charity aimed at recruiting high-flying graduates to teaching and the private University of Buckingham.

Group, one primary and one secondary, both represented schools from a single academy chain. This further supports the view that the ORF was strongly insulated.

6.2.2 The 'expert' subgroup

The Review did contain a subset of non-practicing teaching 'experts' (this term was used in the DfE press release – *Major overhaul of qualifications to raise the standard of teaching* (11th March 2011) (DfE, 2011d) with views known to be sympathetic with the thrust of Government policy. This subgroup included Roy Blatchford, a former head-teacher and school inspector and now Director of the National Education Trust; John McIntosh, former head-teacher of the London Oratory School with strong links to the free-market think tank the Centre for Policy Studies; Dr Dan Moynihan, Chief Executive of Harris Academies, an academy chain endorsed through Government press releases and speeches; Brett Wigdortz from Teach First; and Professor O'Hear who authored the pamphlet *Who teaches the teachers?* (O'Hear, 1988). This subgroup represented an influential bloc and appeared to be well respected by the other Review members:

> I understood the other people on the group are very, very prodigious in the profession, you know they're all very experienced, they were all picked for the knowledge and skills they would bring to the group.
>
> Interview 4 (England).

First, the use of 'I' (singular personal pronoun) here goes some way towards this head-teacher identifying with the others in the group including the 'experts'. This would suggest that this person agreed with their inclusion on the Review.

Second, it suggests that many of them were known 'names' in the field of education in England. Fairclough (2003, p.187) refers to this as, 'mediation of expertise'. The experts were 'prodigious' partly due to their projection through the media. The education scene is quite large in England, in contrast to Scotland, and it is unrealistic that Review members would have all known each other prior to the Review meeting. Hence, it is a form of expertise that is reliant on publicity in addition to subscription to a particular Government policy agenda.

In summary, the fact that the TS were developed under the auspices of the DfE, when most Teaching Standards globally are developed by teaching councils and arms-length government agencies (Kleinhenz & Ingvarson, 2007), it is reasonable to identify the Review and Drafting Group with a DfE controlled ORF. Correspondingly, those excluded from the Review constituted the clearly defined PRF. Bernstein does point out that an autonomous PRF can have influence on the pedagogic discourse developed in the ORF. However, in suggesting, as sections of the interview data did, that all

educational interests were represented on the Review indicates that considerable insulation was placed around the ORF.

This brings into play the significance of the 'ideological screens' brought to the ORF by the Review Group members. The next move is to identify the backstories of the policy actors who occupied the ORF and then determining the ideological screens they brought to the process.

6.2.3 Deregulators and professionalizers

Given the insulation placed around the ORF and their strong representation on the Drafting Group, the expert subgroup had considerable influence on the development of pedagogic discourse. Through analysis of their 'backstories', they broadly represented two identities and ideological traditions: deregulators and professionalizers[19] (Cochran-Smith, 2001; Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2001; Furlong, 2002).

Deregulators view any form of national teaching standards as undesirable. Professionalizers see teaching standards and performance assessments as an essential component of their agenda. The growth of this agenda during the New Labour Government has seen nearly every aspect of teaching and teacher education detailed and regulated in what Bernstein (1996) recognised as the 'totally pedagogised society'.

An identified professionalizer within the Review was the Deputy Chair:

> From my personal standpoint, the Teachers' Standards 2012 are a once-in-a-generation opportunity for teachers across the country to unite behind a set of professional expectations which are focused unequivocally on the classroom. If all teachers meet these expectations we shall have a profession of which society can be rightly proud.
>
> Roy Blatchford, *The 2012 Teachers' Standards in the Classroom* (Blatchford, 2013, p.4).

In this extract teachers are seen as being 'passivated' (Fairclough, 2003, p.145) by the process of standards development. This means that they sat outside and were affected by the process. It was identified as an 'opportunity' for teachers but, in reality, it is a process that is done unto them. This was attuned with 'new professionalism' (c.f. p.25) characterised by centrally orientated teacher compliance with reduced autonomy for the individual and groups of teachers which was a central policy focus for New Labour (Evans, 2008).

[19] Cochran-Smith (2001) refers to this form of individual as a professionalizationist who have concern for the high standards of teaching and teacher education programmes.

Deregulators within the Review include those who deem that formal teaching qualifications were not necessary for the day-to-day activity of teachers and only serve to put barriers in the way of people entering the profession. Within this group was Anthony O'Hear and John McIntosh, both members of the Drafting Group. Furlong (2002), in pointing out the differences between the English and United States of America, recognises a political warrant, as opposed to any form of evidence, as the deregulators' means of influencing Government policy in the 1980s. While this form of ideology was diminished during the period of New Labour Government, it found new influence through the Review.

This deregulatory approach to formal codified forms of teacher knowledge is counterbalanced by the craft knowledge teacher (c.f. p.20), as explained by O'Hear:

> But the lack of sound theoretical knowledge on processes of learning and teaching does not at all mean that there is no knowledge of such things. There is plenty of such knowledge at a practical level and it is vested in a collective wisdom of teachers over generations. This collective wisdom can be tapped by a new teacher who is guided in his teaching practice by experienced teachers, and who enters into something like the apprenticeship Polanyi spoke of to an experience teacher.
>
> *Who Teaches the Teachers?* Anthony O'Hear (O'Hear, 1988, p.18).

In this instance teachers are 'activated' and as determining the development of professional knowledge. Such ideology disregards the need for structured forms of teacher development in favour of a more irregular apprenticeship in line with Polanyi's (1958) 'connoisseurship' (c.f. p.21). Schools are then free to enter the market for teachers which, it is concluded, can only lead to increased quality of teachers recruited.

The 'freedom' to employ teachers without QTS was extended to academies in England by the DfE (DfE, 2012a) on 27th July 2012, the same day as the London Olympics' opening ceremony. This move, carried out without consultation, underlines both the political influence enjoyed by deregulators in England but also the political sensitivity around such moves, possibly due to a lack of evidential warrant.

Deregulators and professionalizers on the Review were mainly confined to the Expert Subgroup. The next move is to consider the ideology of the larger group of head-teachers.

6.2.4 Leaderism: a unifying concept?

Given the number of existing and former head-teachers on the Review Group, they provided a significant ideological screen. A head-teacher member of the Review Group

considered their approach to participating in the Review as aligned with the way they conceive their role:

> …from the point of view of as a head-teacher wanting to have positive impacts on pupils' outcomes and as a teacher meeting the demands of a head-teacher with very high expectations.
>
> Interview 2 (England).

This Review member's approach to developing the TS involves the teacher being 'passivated' and the head-teacher 'activated'. This conceivably, in itself, could represent a particular professionalising agenda (Beck, 2008) and ideological positioning of the head-teacher as the guardian of pupils' outcomes through demanding 'very high expectations' of the teachers within their school. However, this notion of a demanding head-teacher is aligned with the Government policy narrative around greater autonomy for schools and, particularly school leaders, and better fits with the elevation of the importance of school leadership, or leaderism (O'Reilly & Reed, 2010; 2011).

It does represent a significant shift in who is setting the professionalising agenda as the simplified TS, compared with the more detailed 2007 standards, means that the Government is effectively withdrawing from its regulatory role to be replaced by in-school governance. This regulatory discourse, of a more restricted form of teacher professionalism, determines an instructional discourse characterised by the performance model of the 'effective' teacher (c.f. p.22).

In her foreword to *The First Report of the Independent Review of Teachers' Standards* (DfE, 2011a); Sally Coates, Chair of the Review Group, refers to the McKinsey & Company report: *How the world's best performing school systems come out on top* (Barber & Mourshed, 2007) as a 'seminal study'. Coffield (2012) casts considerable doubt over the claims made in the study about the effectiveness of school leadership on the day-to-day elements of teaching. Despite this, the TS are presented as a tool that school leaders should use in making judgements about teacher performance. This is strongly signposted though this genre chain:

> It is right that, in each case, the headteacher should have the freedom to apply the standards in a way that is consistent with the needs and circumstances of his or her school.
>
> The First Report of the *Independent Review of Teachers' Standards* (DfE, 2011a, p.21, p.21).
>
> …head teachers (or appraisers) will assess qualified teachers against the standards to a level that is consistent with what should reasonably be expected of a teacher in the relevant role and at the relevant stage of their career (whether a Newly-Qualified Teacher (NQT), mid-career teacher, or a more experienced practitioner). The

> professional judgement of head teachers and appraisers will therefore be central to appraisal against these standards.
>
> Extract from the introduction to the *Teachers' Standards* (DfE, 2012b, p.3).
>
> We [the Review] asked ourselves what kind of teacher we would want to teach our children and devised eight over-arching principles. These principles, and the sub-points which unpick them, are intended to be minimum expectations, pinning down the most fundamental elements of classroom practice. I'm very pleased with them and I'm glad that their clarity is enabling headeteachers to champion and promote high standards within their classrooms.
>
> Extract from *Headstrong, 11 lessons of School Leadership* by the Chair of the Review, Dame Sally Coates (Coates, 2015).

In all three of these extracts there is a narrative genre that presents a certainty and high degree of commitment around the central role played by head-teachers in implementing the TS.

The first of these extracts in this genre chain describes the head-teacher's freehand in using the TS in 'his' or 'her' school as a 'freedom' and a 'right'. Using the possessive in this way indicates particular ownership over the use of the TS. The head-teacher in this instance is seen as being above the fray and detached from the wider group of teachers in the school, interpreting and implementing guidance.

The last extract in this sequence identifies, through the use of 'we' in referring to the Review, head-teachers as championing high standards in 'their' classrooms as a form of lone crusade. This serves two purposes. First, it passivates teachers, this is something done unto teachers. Second, it indicates a value assumption that only head-teachers have concern for 'high standards'. What is shown through the genre chain is a prominence placed on 'leaderism' being recontextualised from the wider policy discourse into the text of the TS.

The simplifying of the TS can be seen as rolling back regulation but also a signal to head-teachers to create their own school-based regulatory structures for teachers. This perspective is not surprising given the number of head-teachers present on the Review. However, it does present two significant changes from the 2007 standards which had standards for each career stage.

First, given that teaching standards had been identified as national benchmarks for competence, this is a significant challenge to their applicability across different contexts, as pointed out by one of the teaching unions forming part of the PRF:

> The draft standards on assessing performance are far too vague. Individual head teachers will be able to decide what

> they mean in practice so there is no way they can be described as national standards.
>
> Quote from Christine Blower, General Secretary, National Union of Teachers (NUT), *Review of Teaching Standards Press Release*, 14th July 2011 (NUT, 2011).

On the one hand this can be seen as a deregulatory approach, allowing head-teachers to interpret the TS in the way they see fit. On the other hand, it signifies a breaking up of a national system for teaching standards.

The second significant change, in the spirit of the McKinsey & Company report (Barber & Mourshed, 2007), is the furtherance of the role of school leaders in assessing teacher performance. As they formed a significant grouping within the Review, it appears that head-teachers brought together pedagogic discourse that symbolised, through the TS, the concept of leadership or leaderism in schools.

In summary, with the PRF effectively muted in England, the identification of, and struggle to control, the recontextualising field was between school leaders, professionizers and deregulators. While deregulators see any form of regulation as a barrier to recruitment of quality teachers, they did secure a significant rolling-back of the scale and scope of TS in England. Within the broad framework of the TS, school leaders are expected to regulate within their own institutions. This would appear to be a compromise between the professionizers and deregulators with leaderism seen as the unifying concept in so far as teachers are required to meet 'expectations' but this is not part of a national framework.

6.3 The revision of professional standards in Scotland

Teaching Scotland's Future (Donaldson, 2011, herein referred to as TSF) recommended an updating of the *Professional Standards for Teachers* in Scotland (herein referred to as the PST) with a view to providing 'increased coherence' (Donaldson, 2011, p.96) between the different sets of standards that had previously been developed in separate review events at different times. The most recent revision of the PST, during 2012, which is the focus of this research, saw a consolidation of the different sets of standards into one unifying 'suite' during a single review event. The Head of Education at the, now fully independent (c.f. p.82), GTC Scotland took forward the task of setting up a Steering Group and three Writing Groups (GTCS, 2011). The Writing Groups were to mirror the three subgroups of the National Partnership Group (NPG) that had been considering the recommendations from TSF.

6.3.1 The Steering and Writing Groups: a well-worn path to the policy 'village'

The Steering Group consisted of 15-members (3 places were shared members – two people sharing one appointment) (appendix 5) and would oversee the work of the Writing Groups. This included representation from a breath of educational institutions including Education Scotland, the Educational Institute of Scotland (trade union), the Scottish Government and the Association of Directors of Education in Scotland. One of the officers with responsibility for the development of the PST at the GTC Scotland stated:

> …we [GTC Scotland] set up a standards Steering Group and that sat above the Writing Groups, and the standards Steering Group was made up with all the key stakeholders in Scottish education. So, the teaching unions, the Government, employers, the Association of Directors of Education, parent groups, a representative from the Youth Parliament, representative from Education Scotland, so that was a big group. But their job was not to write the standards, their job was to steer the direction … what we did was contact all those key stakeholders and ask for representation; and that was just a letter, for a trade union, the General Secretary, to chief execs. etc. and asked them if they would like to be in the group or would like to nominate someone.
>
> Interview 2 (Scotland).

This structure contributes towards the 'collective narrative' (Hulme & Menter, 2011) in Scottish education, in that most educational institutions were invited to contribute to the Steering Group. This contrasts with the situation in England where the DfE provided a considerable recontextualising principle on the formation of the ORF.

Other than having a seat on the Steering Group, the Scottish Government did not have a say on who should be represented. However, as it was pointed out by one member of the Steering Group interviewed as part of this research, the independent GTC Scotland was created by legislation and it is through a reversal of this legislation that the Scottish Government could take back control.

There were three Writing Groups for the three levels of standards: Writing Group 1 – *Standards for Registration*; Group 2 – *Standard for Career-Long Professional Learning*; Group 3 – *Standards for Leadership and Management*. Whereas the Steering Group was comprehensive in so far as it had representation from many institutions from across Scottish education, the Writing Groups were composed of a separate group of people representing those institutions with more hands-on experience of teaching and teacher development from schools, local authorities and university departments of

education. This contrast with the process in England where local authorities and mainstream universities were excluded.

Although there was not a published mechanism for selecting the members of the Writing Groups, a rationale, provided by a GTC Scotland officer, appeared to centre on the need for each of the three Writing Groups to have both educationalists, with expertise relating to a particular standard, and practitioners at each career-stage:

> …and what we wanted on the groups was representation from the profession, bear in mind what I said about small numbers. So, we had a GTC person, we had representatives from local authorities, a quality improvement officer, education officer, that kind of role; we had teachers and we had teachers from various stages in their career, so we had a probationer teacher for instance, an NQT [newly qualified teacher] … we had teachers who had been Chartered Teachers on the Standard for Career-Long Professional Learning Group, and we had a head-teacher on the head-teacher group, and we had university people, so we had academic input.
>
> Interview 2 (Scotland).

For example, Writing Group 2 – *Standard for Career-Long Professional Learning* - included a GTC Scotland officer, three lecturers from university departments of education, two members representing Charter Teachers[20], a single local authority representative and a primary school teacher (appendix 5). All three university representatives had research backgrounds in teacher development (Doherty & McMahon, 2007; Robinson, 2010; Williamson & Robinson, 2009).

Where the process had some similarities with the one in England is the reference to expertise as a rationale for the selection of members to be part of the Writing Groups. However, the sense in which this expertise was conceived was different from the one in England. One member of Writing Group 1 recognised the elements of their work that contributed towards this expertise:

> I was asked to join the Writing Group that related to teachers at the start of their careers and that was due to my experience of working with probationers. I received an invitation to work with the group by dint of the partnership work I had done with the GTC.
>
> Interview 4 (Scotland).

This sense of expertise is related more to the 'authority of bureaucracies' (Fairclough, 2003, p.187) as opposed to a form of 'mediated' expertise evident in England (c.f. p.92). Bureaucratic forms of expertise are intertwined with government style officialdom

[20] The Charter Teacher programme was the principle programme for continued teacher development in Scotland prior to the revision of the PST.

and committee structures. Yet, the positions that these people occupy have not been affected deeply enough by mass and social media.

Clearly, an exercise like this needs to draw on such expertise; however, given the small size of education in Scotland, compared to England, there seemed to be a good deal of familiarity between members of the Writing Groups:

> I knew a couple of them from work at a national … It's quite small Scotland in the educational community. When you are a head-teacher and done lots of national work you do meet a lot of people.
>
> Interview 1 (Scotland).
>
> …Scottish education being a very small village … I've been involved in Scottish education for 23 years, so I've worked with a number of these people in different roles with different hats on.
>
> Interview 2 (Scotland).

This suggests that that these Writing Group members were 'activated' in that they do 'lots of national work' in the 'village'. There is an implication that there is a larger group of head-teachers and teachers who are not engaged in this work and are 'passivated'. This chimes with the identification of a 'policy elite' (Christie, 2003) within Scottish education (c.f. p.78) and a 'mobility of key actors' between the key institutions of Scottish education (Hulme & Kennedy, 2016, p.97).

While the interview data tended to suggest that there was nothing inherently problematic with this, a counter-view from one of the interviewees suggested that this contributed to a fragmentation within the writing process:

> My experience within the Writing Group? I felt the people who were working for the GTC, or historically close to the GTC, dominated the norms of the Group and the norms of the text that were starting to be thrown about. I felt that in no way at all that it was a blank sheet of paper for these standards.
>
> Interview 5 (Scotland).

This indicates a degree of passivness in regards to 'my experience' as opposed to the more activated GTC Scotland officials and those 'historically close' to them. While this extract was a counterview to those expressed through the other interviews, it does suggest that there was a degree of marginalisation of elements of the Writing Group.

In summary, the identification of the ORF, through the appointments to the Steering and Writing Groups, was regulated by the officials at the GTC Scotland. While the inclusive nature of Scottish education is presented through the wide representation on the Steering Group, there was a more selective element and reliance on 'expertise' for the appropriation of the Writing Groups. There appeared to be a degree of familiarity

amongst the Writing Group members which was described as ‘a very small village’ with more dissident elements pushed to the margins. The mode of expertise is more ‘bureaucratic’ that the ‘mediated’ form in England.

6.3.2 The ‘collective narrative’: interrogating change?

The ‘collective narrative’ (Menter & Hulme, 2011) of Scottish education has been characterised by a ‘strong set of shared values, experiences and understandings’ (Menter & Hulme, 2008), ‘discerned in the discourse of national and local policy-makers, who use it to moderate and interrogate change in their policy-making practices and processes’ (Alexiadou & Ozga, 2002, p.678).

The interview and documentary data demonstrated a large amount of support within the ORF for enquiry and research engagement for teachers broadly aligned with Donaldson’s (2011) ‘reconceptualised model’. The acceptance of academic involvement was signalled by a member of Writing Group 1:

> There’s also a strong academic influence in the emphasis that is put on research and if you look at it you will see things to do with enquiry and things to do with research, things to do with the familiarisation with educational literature, that features quite strongly in there and I think that mirrors an old Scottish tradition as we don’t see teaching as a purely craft-based technique-based profession nor do we see it as an academic profession, it’s this blend of the craft with the academic that creates ‘The Scottish Teacher’ and I think that the Standards reflect that quite well.
>
> Interview 4 (Scotland).

While this extracts uses the subjective modality (I think), it does correspond with the orthodoxy in the Scottish education literature that teaching is a combination of craft and profession (c.f. p.20).

The ideas and (Scottish) traditions informing this narrative point towards Hoyle’s (1974) ‘extended professionality’ characterised by an enquiring and transformative teacher (c.f. p.24). The unsaid assumption being that this might not be a tradition in other nations, such as England. The use of the term ‘Scottish Teacher’ in the interview extract above, indicates a status to the social grouping and seeks to set aside this conception of the teacher from teachers in other nations, such as England.

This concept of the ‘extended’ professional was corroborated by a member of Writing Group 2 who identified a high level of proficiency in teacher enquiry:

> In teacher education in Scotland there has been a very strong focus on an enquiry-based approach; and people were very well versed in that theoretical perspective, particularly the groups involved in Chartered Teachers, they

> would probably have had a good conceptual understanding about teacher education and the nature of teaching.
>
> Interview 6 (Scotland)

A member of Writing Group 3 had completed research on collaborative teacher enquiry and she was a clear advocate of this form of professional enquiry:

> The findings of the research suggest that collaborative professional enquiry has much to offer the profession and this has confirmed my commitment to its centrality within the programmes with which I am involved. I believe it is important to share the findings in order to encourage its practice in schools beyond the boundaries of accredited academic programmes.
>
> Extract from *Leading Collaborative Professional Enquiry: Implications for Teachers, Chartered Teachers and their Managers*, Alison Fox, Doctorate of Education Thesis (Fox, 2009)

What these three extracts above from different genre help to confirm is a policy consensus, or 'collective narrative', around professionalising teaching by developing a form of professional knowledge derived from practitioner enquiry. The final extract's use of 'I' demonstrates a personal commitment to elements of 'extended professionality' incorporating collaborative professional enquiry. This form of personal identity is compatible with the other extracts above and with much of the other interview and documentary data. This is an identity that seeks to push 'The Scottish Teacher' towards the extended end of Hoyle's (1974) continuum.

While much is made of the 'collective narrative' of Scottish education, there seems little evidence of 'interrogating change' (Alexiadou & Ozga, 2002) in the Writing Groups for the PST. This theme warrants further analysis and will be developed further in the next chapter (section 7.3).

6.4 Comparing the ideological screens of the reviews

Chapter 5 argued that the case made for both the reviews of teaching standards in England and Scotland were based on the notions of 'change' and 'continuous improvement' in response to the forces of globalisation. While in England the policy answer was to align teachers with the 'economy of performance', the Scottish response was the development of the 'recontextualised model' and 'The Scottish Teacher'. In moving from the national to the local, this chapter has identified how the recontextualsing field was occupied in order to enact these policy interventions.

There were similarities between the occupation of the ORF. Officials at both the DfE in England and the GTC Scotland regulated the recruitment and selection to the Review and Writing Groups. In England, this included strong insulation around the ORF and a

clearly defined and vocal PRF containing university departments of education, local authorities and teaching unions. Similarly, in Scotland the selections to the Writing Groups drew mainly from those institutions within the Scottish education 'policy elite', albeit, with identifiable expertise in a particular area (for example, people with experience of career professional development for Writing Group 2: *Career-Long Professional Learning Standard*). The PRF was less clearly defined and pushed to the margins of the debate.

While in England there was a reliance on a form of 'mediated' expertise, in Scotland the expertise of the Writing Groups was associated with a more 'bureaucratic' form.

The ORF in England consisted of an amalgam of deregulators, professionalizers and head-teachers. The compromise was a form of 'leaderism' that identified school-based regulation as a counterbalance to the simplified TS. In Scotland the 'ideology' brought to the ORF sought to move 'The Scottish Teacher' towards 'extended' professionality (Hoyle, 1974) characterised by teacher reflection and enquiry. Hence, the emerging pedagogic discourse appears to be attempting to restrict teachers in England within school-based regulatory structures and move 'The Scottish Teacher' towards becoming 'critically informed adaptive experts' in the mould of Hoyle's (1974) extended professionality.

Having established the nature of the occupation of the recontextualising fields of the reviews of teaching standards, the next move is to identify the recontextualising principles under which the recontextualising fields of the reviews were regulated. This sees a further movement in the context of pedagogy from the national to the local and seeks to address the third research question.

Chapter 7: Regulating the recontextualising fields of the reviews of teaching standards

7.1 Introduction

While chapters 5 and 6 identified some similarities between the English and Scottish contexts, including the call for 'continuous improvement' and the use of international evidence to justify policy positions, differences were starting to develop in the emerging pedagogic discourse of the reviews. For example, in chapter 6 a strongly insulated official recontextualising field (ORF) and a relatively automatous pedagogic recontextualising field (PRF) was identified in England. In Scotland, where there was wide support for the 'recontextualised' model proposed by Donaldson (c.f. p.76), the ORF was extended to all major Scottish educational institutions with critical voices push to the margins without an organised PRF.

Additionally, it had been established in the previous chapter that the pedagogic discourse from the reviews was attempting to push teachers in England towards the 'restricted' end of Hoyle's (1974) continuum and 'The Scottish Teacher' towards the 'extended' end.

Bernstein (2000) refers to a recontextualising principle (c.f. p.34) as regulating the actions of those in the recontextualising field including the relocation of discourse to form pedagogic discourse. The analytical focus is now on the textual representation of actions and events relating to the recontextualising principle of the reviews of teaching standards.

This analysis utilises the documents relating to the Review of the *Teachers' Standards* (DfE, 2012b) in England (herein referred to as TS) and the documents relating to the revision of the *Professional Standards for Teachers in Scotland* (2012f; g; h) in addition to the interview data collected from review participants.

Given the desire to determine the rules and regulations of the reviews, the organisation provided by the key institutions – the Department for Education (DfE) in England and the General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTC Scotland) – provides a particular focus. Dimmock (2007, p.293) suggests three dimensions of communicated authority and control as part of organisational cultures which are used to make sense of the rules and regulations of the reviews. These include formal-informal, tight-loose and direct-indirect (c.f. p.37). Each dimension will be applied to the reviews to identify the nature of the organising culture.

To further understand the nature of the regulated recontextualised field, this chapter will also consider the relationship between the ORF and the PRF using Bernstein's concepts of classification and framing (p.32). Chouliaraki (1998) refers to classification as a form of regulation for the 'institutional context of pedagogy'. Framing is referred to as the extent to which the state extends the influence of the ORF and weakens the PRF (O'Meara and MacDonald 2004, p.113).

7.2 A DfE regulated Review

As the introduction to this chapter suggests, the focus for this thesis now falls on the development of the TS and the procedures and organising practices of the *Independent Review of Teachers' Standards* itself (herein referred to as the Review). The Review has previously been characterised as using 'narrower forms of consultation and more selective use of evidence' (Hulme & Menter, 2011, p.77). What this analysis attempts to do is go beyond an external observation of the Review to assess the textual representation of its organising culture to determine the recontextualising principle.

The key documents to be subjected to this analytical treatment are the *Terms of Reference for Review of Teachers' Standards* (DfE, 2011g) and the *First Report of the Independent Review of Teachers' Standards* (DfE, 2011a) in addition to the testimonies of the members of the Review interviewed as part of this research.

The DfE in England assumed responsibility for the TS from the Teaching and Development Agency for Schools (TDA), who had organised the development of the previous *Professional Standards for Teachers* (TDA, 2007). Unlike its counterpart in Scotland, the General Teaching Council for England (GTC England) had never had responsibility for writing teaching standards with its role restricted to the development of a regulatory code of conduct for teachers (GTCE, 2009). The formal announcement of the abolition of the GTC England came in *The Importance of Teaching: The Schools White Paper* (DfE, 2010b) released on 24th November 2010. Also announced was the intention to review the existing teaching standards (c.f. p.67).

In March 2011 a 15-member Review group was selected by the DfE (see chapter 6 for more detail) to which the *Terms of Reference for the Review of Teachers' Standards* (DfE, 2011g) (herein referred to as the Terms of Reference) were issued. The Review met on seven occasions (between 14th March and 4th July 2011) with the Drafting Group, consisting of six Review members, having intervening additional meetings (DfE, 2011a, p.17).

After agreeing what they defined as the purpose of the standards, the Review 'considered evidence from domestic and international sources' including 'evidence from other high-status professions' (ibid). A further call for evidence was carried out with providers of initial teacher education rated 'outstanding' by Ofsted, teacher and head-teacher unions, initial teacher education representative bodies (UCET and NASBTT), and a few selected educational experts. Based on these responses, and after a review of the existing 2007 teaching standards and the GTC England's code of conduct to identify 'the areas which the Review agreed should be retained in the new standards' (DfE, 2011a, p.18), a period of writing and discussion by the Review preceded a draft set of standards being prepared (appendix 3 does provide a timeline for the Review).

7.2.1 Adhering to the Terms of Reference

The two-page Terms of Reference issued by the DfE, set out the aims, timeframe and conduct for the Review. Repeated in an opening context section were the justifications for the Review which had previously formed part of DfE press releases, speeches and the White Paper (c.f. p.67):

> As set out in the Schools White Paper, *The Importance of Teaching*, the proliferation of existing teacher standards means that expectations of teachers may appear unclear, and it can be hard to assess teacher performance and steer professional development. It is therefore necessary to establish rigorous standards of competence, ethics and behaviour that reflect the trust and professionalism society should be able to expect from its teachers.
>
> Extract from the *Terms of Reference for the Review of Teachers' Standards* (DfE, 2011g).

One significant adjustment to the tone of this text extract, compared with the previous DfE releases, was the sole focus on 'standards of competence'. A recontextualisation not only put into the background concepts of craft knowledge for teachers, prominent in a speech by the Secretary of State leading up to the Review (Gove, 2010), but also reference to the performance elements of teaching including the call for 'continuous improvement' (c.f. p.70).

Bernstein (1996, p.68; 2000, p.44) at some length, distinguishes between performance and competence models as he states that they cannot be one and the same. This substitution of performance by competence suggests a degree of policy incoherence associated with defining teachers' professional knowledge.

Following on from this initial context section, the Terms of Reference outlined the aims for the Review:

> The aim of the Review is to establish a set of standards that:

- are unequivocal, clear and easy to understand;
- provide a tool to assess teachers' performance and steer professional development;
- are designed to inspire confidence in the profession;
- focus primarily on the key elements of excellent teaching (including approaches to early reading and early mathematics), how to address poor behaviour and how to support children with additional needs, including special educational needs; and
- encompass standards of ethics and behaviour, both within and outside the school, including, for example, having tolerance and respect for the rights and views of others and not undermining UK democratic values.

Extract from the *Terms of Reference for the Independent Review of Teachers' Standards* (DfE, 2011g).

This list of aims was the principal regulating text for the Review and served two functions. First, it brought together all other discourses on this subject into a single text. Second, it recontextualised those earlier discourses in a way that filtered a number of them.

The first and fourth bullet points strongly indicate the Government's desire for the TS to be reduced in scope and focus on, what is referred to as, the 'key elements of excellent teaching'. This was implicit reference to a universal conception of the teacher which involved narrowing the scope of teachers' professional identity and promoting the 'effective' teacher model (c.f. p.22). For example, there is no reference to the teacher as an enquiring practitioner as found in the PST in Scotland.

The reference to 'early reading' in the fourth bullet point would suggest a particularly focus on the use of Systematic Synthetic Phonics, the whole-scale implementation of which had been a sustained policy objective for the Government. Together with previous releases (DfE, 2011b; Johnston & Watson, 2005), the worth of this teaching method and its uncritical acceptance as the principal method of teaching reading had been nominalised.

The second bullet point refers to 'assessing teacher performance', which appears to contradict reference to competencies in the opening section. The need to 'steer' professional development for teachers further obfuscates agency and excludes other possibilities for the development of teachers' professional knowledge. This effective mode of professionalism was to be for an externally enacted system of ratification and appraisal leading to directed professional development (contrast this with the 'critically informed adaptive experts' present in the PST).

The third bullet point assumes inspiration needs to be externally provided for teachers as opposed to it being an intrinsically internal facet or form part of teachers' shared expression. Reference to 'the best generation of teachers' (c.f. p.68) are now absent.

Collectively the Terms of Reference set out a series of affirmative statements that 'passivated' the teacher and provided a strong recontextualising principle. In doing this the 'institutional context of pedagogy' (Chouliaraki, 1998) was defined for the Review.

The interview data indicated that the Terms of Reference were adhered to quite closely, as two head-teacher members the Review identified:

> I think that we stuck to it very closely and we would often go back to the Terms of Reference in our discussions. The discussions were very wide and far reaching … quite often when we reached bottle necks we would go back to our remit.
>
> Interview 2 (England).
>
> The Secretary of State was really pleased with the Standards. So, I think that we very much did stick to them. We knew that those were our Terms of Reference. I'm trying to think … there may have been one area where we didn't stick to them. I can't remember exactly, we pretty much stuck to the Terms of Reference.
>
> Interview 4 (England).

In this second interview extract the Secretary of State is identified as a significant policy actor and central figure in the development of the TS and there is a sense of ownership of the Terms of Reference by the Review Group members: 'those were our Terms of Reference'.

The unquestioning acceptance of the Terms of Reference could partly be explained by the fact that the Review Group was DfE selected (c.f. p.88) and therefore likely to be sympathetic to the Government's view. Nevertheless, the fact that it formed a central part of the Review's discussion process indicates its strong regulatory function. The analysis will now consider the regulation of the Review beyond the initial Terms of Reference.

7.2.2 A 'formal' organising culture

Much of the justification for the Review emanated from *The Case for Change* (DfE, 2010a), an authorless DfE review of literature and international comparison. Prior to the drafting process a similar range of evidence was considered by the Review (DfE, 2011a, p.31-32). This included teaching standards from countries higher that the United Kingdom in the OECD's (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) 2009 PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment) rankings,

including Singapore, New Zealand, Australia and South Korea. Also considered were the McKinsey Report - *How the world's best performing schools come out on top* (Barber & Mourshed, 2007), UK Government surveys and reports and the existing *Professional Standards for Teachers* (TDA, 2007). The crossover between *The Case for Change* and the range of evidence considered by the Review could have been explained by the fact that the reviewed material was prepared by DfE officials:

> The civil servants at the Department did a lot of research for us, we were all kinds of people who were working and we relied on department civil servants to do a lot of it … what happens is that they do a lot of research and then bring you the papers and then you read it.
>
> Interview 4 (England).
>
> The officials were the ones who said 'you've got to move on, you've got to decide'. I was impressed by their expertise. We would decide things in the main group; there were action points for the Drafting Group or they had to go back and look at the wording. They went away and did that and then brought it back and it worked.
>
> Interview 1 (England).

In these extracts, the DfE officials are represented as active participants in the recontextualising process of the Review and appears to assume direct responsibility for these research activities. In the DfE's own report on the Review (DfE, 2011a) however, these same officials are impersonalised and pushed into the background. For example, there was merely a single sentence in the Terms of Reference which referenced the role of DfE officials: 'Officials' support and secretariat will be led by DfE working with interested parties as appropriate' (DfE, 2011g). This contradicts the interview data where the DfE officials were identified as major players and key policy actors.

Other regulatory functions developed by DfE officials included the limiting of responses to the Call for Evidence to two sides of A4 (Alexander, 2011), the short timeframe for the Review to be completed (14th march to 4th July 2011) and the lack of information shared with Review members about pervious review processes:

> It was done on a very short timeline. I do know Roy Blatchford [Deputy Chair]; Roy and I were probationers together at [name of school] circa 1973 and I have met him subsequently and talked to him about the Review process, and I was surprised by how little he knew about the antecedence to the Review, he knew very little about the Review in 2007. Quite clearly they were given a remit, it was conducted at a pace – six months I think start to finish – whereas the 2006, I think from the starting gun being fired to the final was about three years.
>
> Interview 3 (England).

Although there was a period of stakeholder engagement, the pacing of the Review was in line with a timeframe set by the DfE and clearly limited the amount of time available to the group to externally consult on their own initiative. Bernstein (2000) refers to the concept of 'framing' as a means of regulating the sequencing and pacing of discourse. What is evident here is a particularly strong approach to framing as the Review was completed in a short timeframe which necessitated officials from the DfE carrying out tasks before and between Review meetings.

The final bullet point of the Terms of Reference (encompass standards of ethics and behaviour) refers to what became Part 2 of the TS – *Personal and Professional Conduct*. Since the announcement of the abolition of the GTC England, there was an intent to replace the GTC England's *Code of Conduct and Practice for Registered Teachers* (GTCE, 2009) by incorporating it within the TS. This amalgamation of standards of competence and conduct was not presented to the Review as a point for discussion but as a clearly identified aim. However, despite explicit reference to it in the Terms of Reference, it appears that the process of generating the two different parts of the TS were not the same:

> The drafting process wasn't the same. Part 2 [of the TS] was very much Department [for Education] generated. Taking the [GTC England] Code of Conduct and tweaking it. So, it wasn't the same sort of process as for Part 1 [of the TS]. The Drafting Group spent the bulk of the time working on the eight [standards in Part 1] and then looking at and tweaking Part 2. Really, it wasn't the same type of process … I would have liked us [the Review group] to have had ownership of both parts of the standards. I don't think we had absolute ownership of Part 2.
>
> Interview 1 (England).

This restriction placed on the Review limited their remit and reduced their role to editors of Part 2 of the TS instead of writers. This significantly regulated the role of the Review Group over this part of the TS despite the claims to their independence.

In effect the *Independent Review of Teachers' Standards* formed two separate review events within the ORF: the identified Review members and the DfE officials. First, there was a review for Part 1 of the TS with the Review and Drafting Group centre stage in the drafting process within a DfE regulated framework. Second, Part 2 of the TS was developed by DfE officials with the Review members acting as editors. This suggests that the organisational culture (Dimmock, 2007) was both formal, as there were clear rules and regulations, and direct, as a number of tasks were completed by the DfE officials. Whereas one of the arguments developed in Chapter 6 was that the selection of the Review and occupation of the ORF was heavily insulated, the argument moves

on to suggest that this same Review were subject to considerable regulation and a strong recontextualising principle.

7.2.3 'Testing and engagement'

The post drafting consultation on the TS was characterised as a period of 'testing and engagement' (DfE, 2011a, p.18) and took place between 16 May and 10 June 2011, involving a series of meetings, or 'facilitated discussions' (ibid), with selected initial teacher training providers and schools engaged in teacher training. There were also meetings between the Chair of the Review, Dame Sally Coates, and the main teacher and head-teacher unions. This more restrictive form of consultation, over a three-week period, with selected stakeholders focused on those schools where teacher training was prominent. This format was followed instead of going out to wider public consultation.

The questions posed to those involved in this 'engagement' were modelled on the language used in the Terms of Reference. Participants were asked, for example, whether they thought the standards were unequivocal, clear and easy to understand and whether they would inspire confidence in the profession. One question specifically asked whether the standards served their function of assessing teacher performance:

> **Q2: Are the draft standards suitable for use when assessing performance?**
>
> The number of comments in response to this question was again very high; the answer to the question was again generally negative … There was particular disquiet about whether assessment against a number of the bullets would be possible, in particular where terms such as 'foster a love of learning', 'promote the values of scholarship', and 'uphold public trust in the profession' have been used …. It was suggested that a single set of standards covering ITT and Induction fails to identify how teachers progress during the NQT year.
>
> Extracts from Appendix F – Summary of Feedback from Wider Engagement, *First Report of the Independent Review of Teachers' Standards* (DfE, 2011a).

The interpretation of the feedback by DfE officials was that it was 'negative' and that those unidentified respondents had 'disquiet' as part of some form of protest. The representation of these responses in this way is a transformation in identifying these responses negatively. The assumption being that those responding agree with the premise that these standards should be used to assess 'performance'. This partly serves to define the form of engagement with stakeholders on this particular question in conflicting terms.

Some institutions decided not to respond to the question format of the consultation. For example, the third largest teaching union in England, the Association of Teachers and Lecturers (ATL) decided to provide a more holistic response:

> ATL believes that these draft standards are fundamentally flawed, portraying an uncertainty as to their very purpose. They are a combination of standards, job description and disciplinary code … The draft standards' level of prescription and watering down of continuing professional development (CPD) into a performance and improvement focussed strategy further demonstrates this narrower view of teacher professionalism.
>
> Extract from the *DfE Review of Teachers' Standards, ATL response*, 10th June 2011 (ATL, 2011)

This response, from the more moderate teaching union, indicates how far recontextualisation had changed the pedagogic discourse that started by proclaiming 'the best generation of teachers' (c.f. p.68).

Following a report on the feedback, the Review met to consider making changes to the TS. Judging by the two extracts above, it is evident that only minimal adjustments were made to the original draft standards. Given that the final meeting of the Review was on 24th June 2011, it is difficult to see how all the responses could have meaningfully informed the process, although, this was not the opinion of a leading head-teacher member of the Review:

> All the consultation was looked at extensively and quite a lot of it was taken into account. But obviously, we were an independent review group so we also had our own opinions, so, we took into account what we thought worked with the way we felt about it. And obviously, we couldn't take into account – there were so many diverse views – you couldn't take everything into account but we looked where there was strong opinion and took that into account.
>
> Interview 4 (England).

This response was typical of those Review members interviewed as part of this research who generally felt that the consultation on the TS was sufficient.

Given that this part of the Review was entitled 'testing and engagement' and that the responses from this exercise would be incorporated in the TS only if they 'worked with the way we felt about it' (interview 4), it is clear that there was significant backgrounding of the views of the PRF which further insulated the ORF.

As argued in Chapter 6, the ORF was insulated from the PRF through the selection of the Review members. The evidence presented here suggests that there is an additional layer of insulation placed around the Review by the recontextualising principle provided by the DfE officials. Bernstein uses the concept of framing to

describe the way discourse is mediated between the ORF and PRF. In this regard, it was the DfE officials who were framing, through the pacing, sequencing and regulating of the Review, and mediating the flow of discourse between the Review and those excluded from it (the PRF).

7.3 The revision of the *Professional Standards for Teachers* in Scotland

Some of the differences between educational policy making in England and Scotland in recent years have been characterised by varying degrees of responses to globalisation (c.f. p.24). Whereas in England there has been an unfettered embrace of global 'policy borrowing' (Phillips, 2015), in Scotland, policy formation has been characterised by far greater mediation through a 'public service partnership model' (Ozga, 2005a) and wider public consultation.

Christie (2003, p.854) suggested two contrasting interpretations for the apparent consensual nature of standards development in Scotland. On the one hand, there is the view that professional involvement in the writing of standards leads to a more responsive text and high levels of professional trust. The alternative view is that professional institutional involvement merely masks a form of centralised control by a 'policy elite'.

Given this background, this chapter will now consider how the revision of the PST in Scotland was regulated while at the same time drawing out some of the differences and similarities, where they exist, with the process in England.

7.3.1 The mixed identity of the GTC Scotland

The impetus for the revision of the PST came from recommendations laid down in *Teaching Scotland's Future* (Donaldson, 2011) (herein referred to as TSF), including the recommendation for a Standard for Active Registration (c.f. p.81) to be developed by the fully independent GTC Scotland. After the publication of TSF, the National Partnership Group[21] (NPG), which included officials from the GTC Scotland, was set up by the Scottish Government to look at how Donaldson's recommendations could be implemented. In their report (Scottish Government, 2011), the NPG acknowledged the work already underway to revise the PST, which had been announced by the Chief Executive of GTC Scotland at their Council meeting on 7th December 2011 (see appendix 3 for a comparative timeline). The revision process took about a year to

[21] The NPG contained representatives from the Scottish Government, the Scottish Teacher Education Committee, the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities, Education Scotland and the General Teaching Council.

complete and approval of the revised PST was granted at the corresponding Council meeting on Wednesday 5 December 2012.

A 15-member Steering Group (appendix 5), consisting of key stakeholders in Scottish education, was set up by the GTC Scotland to oversee the development of the revised suite of standards. Beneath this group, there were three Writing Groups (appendix 5) convened by GTC Scotland officials. These groups modelled the sub-committees of the NPG[22] and comprised a different set of representatives to those on the Steering Group. Each Writing Group contained between six and nine members and were responsible for writing each of the standards which Donaldson broadly outlined in his recommendations (*Standards for Registration*, *Standard for Career-Long Professional Learning* and *Standards for Leadership and Management*). Each of the Writing Groups was led by the GTC Scotland official who had sat on the corresponding NPG sub-committee.

Since full independence, the GTC Scotland has assumed control of the approval and entry requirements for courses to initial teacher education, continuing professional development for teachers and the development of teaching standards. Such policy making, particularly since devolution in Scotland, has tended to happen in a consensual manner and has been characterised by a 'shared assumptive world' (Menter & Hulme, 2008) and 'collective narrative' (Popkewitz et al., 1999). However, the 'collective narrative' was questioned in Chapter 6 as there appeared to be little critique of the policy pronouncements emanating from TSF (c.f. p.78).

Unlike in England, where exacting Terms of Reference were issued by the DfE, in Scotland the remit for the revision of the PST partly flowed from TSF but were largely implicit. For its part, in responding to TSF, the Scottish Government endorsed the vast majority of the recommendations including those relating to the revision of the PST, while at the same time confirming that this was a matter for the GTC Scotland:

> The report recognises the strategic role of the General Teaching Council Scotland (GTCS). Our overall approach to teacher education in Scotland benefits from being anchored in well-respected professional standards. We therefore endorse the suggestion that the GTCS takes the opportunity to undertake an overall review of the framework of the standards, ensuring coherence around the models of teacher professionalism set out in the report (recommendation 35).
>
> Extract from *Continuing to build excellence in teaching: The Scottish Government's Response to Teaching Scotland's Future* (Scottish Government, 2011).

[22] The sub-committees of the NPG were Sub-Group 1: Early Phase of Teaching; Sub-Group 2: Career-Long Professional Learning; and Sub-Group 3: Professional Learning for Leadership.

> As a member of the National Partnership Group and in line with the Group's ongoing discussions, GTC Scotland planned to take forward a review of the Standards. The Head of Educational Services would be setting up a steering group, together with three working/writing groups which would mirror the sub-groups of the National Partnership Group.
>
> Chief Executive Verbal Report, minutes from the GTC Scotland Council meeting 7th December 2011 (GTCS, 2011).

Within both text extracts the GTC Scotland is 'activated' as having a 'strategic role' and identified as the institution for organising the development of the revised PST. Clearly identified here and elsewhere (Watson & Fox, 2015, p.142) is the centralised policy role played by the GTC Scotland. Additionally, as identified in the second extract, there is a named individual (The Head of Educational Services at the GTC Scotland) to take forward this work. This contrasts to the situation in England where the DfE officials had an anonymous existence.

The GTC Scotland was to take forward the revision of the PST with limited input from the Scottish Government, and their associated institutions, other than an endorsement for the 'models of teacher professionalism' (regulatory discourse) characterised by Donaldson. This positioned the GTC Scotland as the key policy organisation:

> …you probably know a bit about the National Partnership Group, the National Implementation Board, there's been a staged process of implementing the recommendations from Donaldson and we're still quite early on in that and we [the GTC Scotland with other Scottish education institutions] are looking nationally at that.
>
> Interview 2 (Scotland).
>
> I think that that was one of the key points of the GTC doing that there was no government-led agenda around standardising teachers per se or even making it overly academic or undervalued or under-pitched. Balance was really important with the standard.
>
> Interview 1 (Scotland).
>
> So, the final stage in terms of this representation was, after the Writing Groups had done their work, and after the Steering Group had said 'we're happy with this', it still had to go to the Full Council [of the GTC Scotland] to see if they were happy with it and there were some last-minute negotiations to seal the deal.
>
> Interview 4 (Scotland).

The representation of the GTC Scotland in these interview extracts demonstrates a mixed identity. On the one hand, it is independent from Government and representative of teachers and other stakeholders as an independent policy developing institution. On the other hand, through the interlocking committee structure of Scottish education it

has a distinct recontextualising and policy implementation role. The task now is to determine which of these identities was present during the development of the PST.

So far what has been established is the central role played by the GTC Scotland in receiving uncritically (c.f. p.96) the recommendations from TSF and then organising independently the revision of the PST. Both identities provide a significant recontextualising principle in the regulation of the ORF of the GTC Scotland and will now be considered separately. This will take the form of viewing the GTC Scotland as a 'regulated' institution through the 'collective narrative' of Scottish education and as a 'self-regulating' and 'negotiating' institution by virtue of its independence from the Scottish Government.

7.3.2 The 'regulated' GTC Scotland

The analysis will now consider the GTC Scotland's role in the context of wider Scottish educational policy development. At first glance, the GTC Scotland had a large amount of autonomy from the Scottish Government to carry out the revision of the PST. After all, it is the world's first fully independent teaching council (c.f. p.82). This would suggest that the GTC Scotland had a freehand to develop the PST. However, this appeared not to be the case.

First, the interlocking committee structure associated with the implementation of Donaldson's recommendations meant that the structural boundaries (Fairclough, 2005) between the various educational institutions appeared to have become blurred. For example, GTC Scotland officials sat on the NPG sub-committees and then chaired the corresponding PST Writing Groups as part of the revision of the PST. These officials were the key policy actors in mediating discourse from the NPG to the Writing Groups.

Second, outside of the Steering and Writing Groups sat two sub-groups of the NPG who had a remit to develop texts relating to professional values, school leadership and 'Learning for Sustainability'. These substantial elements of the revised PST did not form part of the remit for the Writing Groups and were introduced towards the start of the process as recalled by a member of Writing Group 1 and a member of Writing Group 2:

> There were also themes that we were given that had to permeate through all the Standards. There was work that was done on values and commitment and a decision was taken early on, so it didn't matter which Writing Group you were on, those values and commitments were the same and I agree with the philosophy entirely. If you're a student teacher, why should your values be any different to a head-teacher or a systems leader.
>
> Interview 4 (Scotland).

> We seemed to get key texts together, paragraphs and diagrams and such like came to the fore fairly quickly, which, for me, I felt bounded the possibilities. So, Sustainability was in there straight away, that didn't come from anyone from within the Group.
>
> Interview 5 (Scotland).

Both extracts confirm that texts relating to values and sustainability, intended for inclusion within the PST, were written outside of the three Writing Groups. However, the two extracts differ in how this move is represented. While the members of Writing Group 1 'agreed' with this approach, the member of Writing Group 2 felt passivated by this as it 'bounded the possibilities'. This is one of the issues that demarcates the 'insider' ORF, where this approach to text formation was acceptable, and the the more peripheral PRF, where it was not.

There are similarities with this situation and the development of Part 2 of the TS in England (c.f. p.109) as texts were developed outside of the 'official' Review and Drafting Groups.

The concept of Learning for Sustainability, closely associated with the One Planet Schools agenda, has its roots from across the Scottish political and social spectrum. The One Planet Schools agenda formed part of the 2011 SNP manifesto (SNP, 2011) which led to the Scottish Government's One Planet Group (Scottish Government, 2012a). There appears however to be considerable influence from the World Wide Fund for Nature through their document *One Planet Living: an agenda for Scotland* (WWF, 2006) and through their representation on the Steering Group for the revision of the PST (appendix 5):

> Within 6 months, ensure teacher training has met the Professional Standard's global citizenship and sustainable development criteria. By the end of 2011, begin a national programme of 'One Planet School Professional Development' for all practicing teachers, enabling teachers to take this forward.
>
> Extract from *A manifesto for 2011: time for a one planet Scotland* (WWF, 2010, p.33).
>
> We welcome proposals for the creation of One Planet Schools, and will look at ways of developing this concept. This will include action to continue the development of Professional Standards around sustainability education and leadership within our schools on environmental issues.
>
> Extract from the *Scottish National Party 2011 manifesto* (SNP, 2011, p.24).
>
> 'Learning for Sustainability' is a whole-school commitment that helps the school and its wider community develop the knowledge, skills, attitudes, values and practices needed to take decisions which are compatible with a sustainable

> future in a just and equitable world. Learning for sustainability has been embedded within the Standard for Career-Long Professional Learning to support teachers in actively embracing and promoting principles and practices of sustainability in all aspects of their work.
>
> Extract from the Introduction to the *Standards for Career-Long Professional Learning* (GTCS, 2012f).

The three extracts use a genre of governance in a promotional way (Fairclough, 2003, p.33) to bring to the fore Learning for Sustainability. The SNP manifesto makes a commitment about the content of the PST despite the GTC Scotland's organising responsibility for their development. The seamless movement of the concept of Learning for Sustainability, from a lobby group publication to political manifesto and then onto the PST, suggests a recontextualisation of a specific pedagogy from the political sphere, across structural boundaries, into the professional one. However, due to the interlocking committee structure, it is difficult to determine where the first one ends and the second one begins.

Bernstein (2000) would recognise this as strong classification (c.f. p.36) due to the boundaries placed around the knowledge associated with Learning for Sustainability. Hence, what we see here is Learning for Sustainability, formally introduced by a lobby group, then forming part of a manifesto pledge before being identified as a major component of teachers' professional knowledge in Scotland. Although this might be one example, it does suggest an element of a 'direct' organisational culture on the GTC Scotland with certain texts of the PST being developed outside the Writing Groups and 'leapfrogging intermediate levels' (Dimmock, 2007, p.294). Elsewhere (Hulme & Kennedy, 2016, p.98), this form of regulation has been identified as 'exercising soft power' through the work of seminars, reviews and expert groups.

7.3.3 The 'self-regulating' GTC Scotland

The focus now switches to consider the identity of the GTC Scotland as a self-regulated institution. This will be done with a particular focus on the PST writing, drafting and consultation process.

During the winter and spring of 2012, the Steering and Writing Groups met to identify a broad approach to the revision process, carry out research and producing drafts. While the 15-member Steering Group consisted of major stakeholders in Scottish education, the three Writing Groups drew mainly from a pool of head-teachers and teachers, local authority and university representatives, and GTC Scotland officials.

The writing process involved the three Writing Groups being brought together for an initial briefing and then splitting off to work within their individual groups. The existing

teaching standards were used as a reference point to start discussions. As the revision process developed, draft versions of the PST were circulated to group members and comments invited and discussions held:

> I think there were publishers and writers, the Steering Group would take the coherence between all the groups, the remit that they had, they tried to make sure that there was a standard across them all, they would come back with key points to reconsider to make sure there was alignment [between the Writing Groups]. They were more to do with matching all the aspects of the standards.
>
> Interview 1 (Scotland).

This afforded a greater level of control for the content of the PST to the Writing Groups. As one of the GTC Scotland officials identified, the size of the Writing Groups was determined for a particular role:

> So, what we [GTC Scotland] wanted to do with the Writing Groups was – the Steering Group was big because it represented all the key stakeholders – we wanted the Writing Groups to be really small and focused because the nature of the task … what we didn't want to do was to agree standards by committee in that sense so we [GTC Scotland officials] set up three Writing Groups.
>
> Interview 2 (Scotland).

The rationale provided here, by someone who through using the possessive (we) had a clear identity with the process, highlights the tension between the need to agree a final draft for the standards and the desire for input and representation from stakeholders. However, there is a disparaging of a large Steering Group as a means of doing things 'by committee'. This insight points to a hierarchy of influence within the Steering and Writing Groups with the Writing Groups identified as the 'writers' and the Steering Group as 'publishers'.

The interview data suggested that the Writing Groups was where the key decisions about the text of the PST were made. However, the level of engagement did appear to differ from group to group. One head-teacher member of Writing Group 1, who had previously worked for the GTC Scotland, appeared to be fully engaged with the process:

> We met up very regularly, it was quite an intense piece of work, it was fortnightly or every three weeks, there were emails and drafts moved around …. The initial first meetings were about what we thought the document should look like and then we had a go a writing it. Lots and lots of editing, lots of redrafts, and trying to align it with other groups, that was a key thing too.
>
> Interview 1 (Scotland).

Whereas a member of Writing Group 2 identified the lack of specific roles within the group as a weakness of the review process with group members taking it upon themselves to carry out certain drafting activities. They viewed the Writing Group as more of a discussion or means of receiving feedback on drafts:

> The standard was written well outside the Writing Group, but they probably found it helpful to have the Writing Groups, the conversations, and some fairly heated and robust discussions within that. So, was that a Writing Group? No … so, the group I was in, we didn't commission any work as such, set tasks for folk to go away, we didn't agree tasks that were meant to be shared out between meetings.
>
> Interview 5 (Scotland).

Although this was a counter view from the rest of the interview data, it does highlight the 'informal' nature of the writing process, characterised by blurred roles and flexibility in working (Dimmock, 2007, p.293). As this extract explains, the fact that the writing of this standard was in the hands of two or three members suggests a particularly hierarchical process within Writing Group 2. Taking together all the interview data, it would suggest that there were fairly 'loose' (Dimmock, 2007) approaches taken to drafting the PST across the Writing Groups with some individual members taking it on themselves to complete different tasks.

7.3.4 The 'negotiating' GTC Scotland

A period of public consultation on the PST ran from 29th August to 6th November 2012, which was considerably longer than the corresponding three-week 'testing and engagement' in England. This consisted of an online survey, to which there were 79 responses, three regional meetings in Edinburgh, Glasgow and Aberdeen, and a series of 'Glow Meetings' (GTCS, 2012e). The online survey consisted of a questionnaire with sections covering issues relating to the rationale for the changes, the three predetermined themes of values, leadership and sustainability, and then the three draft sets of the PST (GTCS, 2012b; c; d).

The response to the consultation was published in the GTC Scotland's *Report on Consultation on the Revision of the Standards* (GTCS, 2012e). The document summarised the responses to each of the eight sections before going on to identify 'what we did'. This appears to have been a genuine attempt at consultation and there was disappointment with the relatively low turnout as identified by one member of Writing Group 2:

> The standards went out for consultation with the profession and there was quite a poor response despite a lot of promotion and I think that that was quite disappointing; but there were some really good responses and that was

> reflected in the final draft … sometimes practitioners can be cynical about consultation exercises about whether their views are taken on board, and being part of that process, I could genuinely say that the responses to the consultation were carefully considered and adopted.
>
> Interview 6 (Scotland).

This should be contrasted with the attitude to the 'testing and engagement' in England where responses were 'taken into account' with what worked with the way they 'felt about it'.

One area where adaptations were made to the text of the PST was in answer to the consultation response from the Educational Institute of Scotland (EIS, 2012), the largest teacher trade union in Scotland. They expressed concern that the PST would refer to Donaldson's 'reconceptualised' model for the teaching profession (Donaldson, 2011) and portray a negative view of existing teaching practice:

> Contemporary society in which teachers work is complex and dynamic. This requires a reconceptualisation of what it means to be a teacher (Teaching Scotland's Future 2011). To be effective over a career in this environment, teachers need to be committed from the outset to career-long learning.
>
> Extract from the introduction to the Draft version of *The Standard for Career-Long Professional Learning* (GTCS, 2012c) released in August 2012 as part of the consultation process.
>
> The reference to Teaching Scotland's Future seems to imply an uncritical acceptance of all that is contained within that report. The EIS believes that whilst the report has much to commend it as the basis for further developing teacher professionalism, its findings should not be wholly uncontested and therefore the EIS finds the tone of the GTC response to be disappointing. Phrases such as 'reconceptualising the teaching profession' seem unnecessarily dismissive of current practice in Scotland.
>
> Extract from the *Consultation on the Review of GTC Scotland Professional Standards, Response from the EIS* (EIS, 2012)

The representation of TSF as being 'uncontested' by the GTC Scotland questions the seamless movement of Donaldson's recommendations to the PST. Nevertheless, all references to reconceptualising were removed from the final drafts of the *Standard for Career-Long Professional Development*. However, what is more significant for this research is the fact that significant changes to the presentation of the PST were made outside the Steering and Writing Groups. The interview data suggested that this occurred on the fringe of the GTC Scotland Council as a way of sealing 'the deal' (c.f. p.83) with the EIS acting as significant 'veto players' (Hulme & Kennedy, 2016, p.97).

In conclusion, what has been revealed is a ‘direct’ and formal approach to the cascading of policy relating to the PST from TSF through the interlocking committee of Scottish education. The Writing Groups adopted a more ‘informal’ approach with some key policy actors identified as leading this process. Finally, a critique of the policy was part of last-minute negotiations taking place outside of the Writing Group.

7.4 Assessing the regulation of the reviews of teaching standards

This chapter has considered the regulation and organisational culture of the reviews of teaching standards. In England this has been identified as a ‘classic bureaucracy’ (Dimmock, 2007) with DfE officials heavily involved in the regulation and framing of the drafting and consultation process. For example, the short timeframe for the Review meant that much of the research and document preparation was conducted by these officials.

The GTC Scotland acted as an institution pulled in several directions and adopted a mix of identities. First, the recontextualisation across structural boundaries of discourse from organisations outside of the GTC Scotland appeared to ‘bound the possibilities’ in certain areas. Second, as a self-regulatory organisation, the GTC Scotland adopted a ‘informal’ and flexible approach to the modes of working within the Writing Groups with the GTC Scotland officials being particularly influential on the final text of the PST. Modifications were made to the PST as a result of consultation but the overall policy recommendations form TSF were enacted.

One area where there were similarities between the regulation of the reviews in England and Scotland was in the development of texts outside of the official writing processes relating to values and, in England, to teachers’ conduct. Both Part 2 of the TS in England, and the section on values and personal commitments of the PST in Scotland, were written outside of the main review events. This represents a strong approach to, what Bernstein refers to as, the classification of knowledge.

Chapter 6 argued that, with the Review in England drawing from a sub-set of the education sector aligned with Government policy, the centrally controled ORF was insulated from the relatively autonomous PRF. Added to this, the strong framing by DfE officials mediated much of the communication between the ORF and PRF, effectively provided a second layer of insulation between the two. Contrastingly in Scotland, the strong classification of knowledge, particularly in relation to the recontextualised model for teacher professionalsim, was only significantly challenged during the consultation period. In this regard, the GTC Scotland adopted a third and final identity as a negotiating organisation.

Chapters 5, 6 and 7 have transcended pedagogic contexts from global through to national and onto local. This has unlocked the emerging pedagogic discourse of the reviews and established the recontextualising principles under which they were regulated. The next chapter looks in more detail at the texts emanating from the reviews to identify more accurately the pedagogic discourse.

Chapter 8: The official knowledge base: bringing teachers' professional knowledge into order

8.1 Introduction

This chapter continues to follow the recontextualisation of discourse from the global and national to the local context of the Review and Writing Groups. The specific analytical focus is now on the teaching standards themselves, the text of the *Teachers' Standards* (DfE, 2012b) in England (herein referred to as TS) and the *Professional Standards for Teachers* in Scotland (2012f; g; h) (herein referred to as PST), and their associated documents (table 5, c.f. p.51). Additionally, accounts from those involved in the reviews are used to help illustrate how pedagogic discourse informed the text of the teaching standards.

Mindful that Bernstein referred to pedagogic discourse as instructional discourse embedded in regulatory discourse, this chapter will build on the findings in the previous chapters to fully elaborate the knowledge base for, and identities of, teachers in the two sets of standards. In regards to teachers' professional knowledge, this chapter adopts a broad definition and is concerned with the knowledge, values, attributes, skills and dispositions required of teachers. This includes the forms of teacher knowledge and identity shown in section 2.2.1: the craft knowledge teacher, the virtuous teacher, the effective teacher, the reflective teacher, the enquiring teacher and the transformative teacher (c.f. p.19-24).

Darling-Hammond (1999, p.12) identifies two problems with developing a common knowledge base for teachers. First, there is the difficulty of bringing together the breadth of 'useful and useable' knowledge available to teachers. Second, the translation of knowledge derived from empirical evidence into a form that is accessible to practitioners has proved to be problematic. Added to this, there is a third challenge of determining a core set of values that inform teachers' practice.

In addressing these challenges, authors have tended to adopt either a regulatory or developmental approach to developing teaching standards (Sachs, 2005, c.f. p.23). Regulatory approaches can be loosely mapped onto Hoyle's (1974) 'restricted professionality' characterised by limited involvement in non-teaching professional activities, classroom events perceived in isolation and practice based largely on intuition (the effective teacher). Developmental standards are inclined towards Hoyle's 'extended professionality' characterised by professional collaboration, reading of

professional literature and practice mediated through theory (the enquiring and transformative teachers).

8.2 The 'regulatory' *Teachers' Standards* in England

The TS officially came into use on 1st September 2012 and consist of three sections – the 'Preamble', Part 1 entitled 'Teaching' and Part 2 'Personal and Professional Conduct'. The document consists of nine pages of which three pages are taken up with the TS themselves. One of the key recommendations from the *Independent Review of Teachers' Standards* (DfE, 2011a) (herein referred to as the Review) was that there should to be a single set of teaching standards[23] replacing the existing hierarchically structured *Professional Standards for Teachers* (TDA, 2007) and the *Code of Conduct and Practice for Register Teachers* (GTCE, 2009, herein referred to as the Code of Coduct).

Part 1 of the TS consists of eight standard statements or 'headings', each one prefixed the words 'a teacher must', which adopts the more categorical affirmative modalised form (Fairclough, 2003, p.168) than the 'should' used in the previous set of standards. This brings a sense of urgency and an authoritarian form to the text. Elsewhere, the teacher is characterised as a solitary professional who must 'demonstrate', 'be accountable for', 'adapt' and 'manage' various aspects of teaching. An underling assumption is that the normative definitions of 'good' teaching is author defined and not open to any form of dialogical engagement. The 'learner' and 'learning' of the previous standards is replaced by the 'pupil' and 'work' and, as signposted in preceding press releases (DfE, 2011d; e), reference to teachers working collaboratively is absent (c.f. p.72).

Beneath the standard heading are a series of bulleted statements aiming to 'amplify the scope of each heading' (DfE, 2012b, p.3). Criticism of the bullets include the fact that they 'are too vague' or that 'they do not link to the main Standard in any meaningful way' (NUT, 2012) with many of them appearing to cover much of the ground vacated by the previous set of standards (Nunn, 2012).

Part 2 of the TS, entitled 'Personal and Professional Conduct', has a disciplinary function in replacing the GTC England's Code of Conduct (GTCE, 2009) (c.f. p.109). This includes a focus on 'standards of ethics and behaviour', a 'professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school' and an 'an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks' (DfE, 2012b, p.9).

[23] After the Review considered the *Teachers' Standards* there was a second review event that developed the *Master Standard* that was never published by the DfE.

The analysis presented here identifies the key themes and associated discourses found in the TS. Given this brief introduction to the TS, the task now is to consider how the pedagogic discourse of the Review developed the text of the TS.

8.2.1 Which moral purpose for the Teachers' Standards?

In a speech entitled *Michael Gove on the moral purpose of school reform* (Gove, 2011) delivered on the 16th June 2011, at the same time the Review was proceeding, Michael Gove MP, the then Secretary of State for Education, outlined his moral purpose for education and reform agenda:

> Because it is only through learning – the acquisition of intellectual capital – that individuals have the power to shape their own lives. In a world which globalisation is flattening, in which unskilled jobs are disappearing from our shores, in which education determines income and good qualifications are the best form of unemployment insurance, we have to ensure every child has a stock of intellectual capital which enables them to flourish … we cannot allow ourselves to have lower expectations for more disadvantaged parts of the country. Of course I accept that schools in such communities face harder challenges but I also know that these challenges can be met. Deprivation need not be destiny.
>
> Michael Gove on the moral purpose of education reform: speech to the *National College for School Leadership* Annual Conference (Gove, 2011), 15th September 2011.

The moral argument for reform, made in this speech and other government documents (DfE, 2010a; b), is framed in economic terms. For example, learning is referred to as 'intellectual capital' and qualifications as 'unemployment insurance'. For individuals wishing to engage with such a system their social inclusion is 'on the basis of exchange' (Ozga & Lingard, 2007). Hence, it is through employment that individuals form part of, and contribute towards, the wider aims for society. The propositional assumption here is that other forms of social policy around entitlement are unnecessary, or even undesirable, and that the sole vehicle for the betterment of the individual, and by inference the nation as a whole, is through economic means. In such a scenario, the social factors of children can be made irrelevant by 'good' teaching underpinned by teaching standards.

The identified 'challenge' for schools and teachers as part of this moral cause is to reverse the potentially negative effects of deprivation or social background on a pupil's educational attainment. This form of intervention is significant in two regards. First, there is the focus on the individual child and their social mobility. The focus is not on alleviating deprivation for all, in fact, there is tacit acknowledgement that deprivation is

and always will be present. Second, there is an attempt to link the progress and attainment of the individual child as the 'moral purpose' for education and at the same time obfuscate other moral aims. It is this second point where there is an attempt to achieve hegemony for it is hard to argue against the phrase 'deprivation need not be destiny'.

Interviews with head-teacher members of the Review identified academic attainment and progress of the individual pupil as being particularly important with strong links made between 'good' teaching and 'good' attainment for pupils. Kleinhenz & Ingvarson (2007, p.13), drawing on the work of McAninch (2003), point to the dangers of a 'causal nexus' explicitly linking, through teaching standards, teaching and learning, as to link the two serves to disregard the other social influences on a pupil's learning and 'progress'. However, this notion was overlooked in the final text of the TS as the second TS demonstrates:

> **2. Promote good progress and outcomes by pupils**
>
> - be accountable for pupils' attainment, progress and outcomes
> - be aware of pupils' capabilities and their prior knowledge, and plan teaching to build on these
> - guide pupils to reflect on the progress they have made and their emerging needs
> - demonstrate knowledge and understanding of how pupils learn and how this impacts on teaching
> - encourage pupils to take a responsible and conscientious attitude to their own work and study.
>
> Standard 2, *Teachers' Standards* (DfE, 2012b)

What is evident in Standard 2 is the accountability of teachers for the 'outcomes' for pupils, which is consistent with a performance orientation for teachers. This would be aligned with the 'effective' teacher model. However, a closer look at this standard does suggest teachers should have knowledge of 'how pupils learn', 'their prior knowledge' and how pupils may reflect on their 'progress'. How such knowledge should, or could, be acquired is left open to interpretation.

The Preamble of the TS, consisting of a mere two sentences and largely attributed to Roy Blatchford (Review Deputy Chair) who had previously been identified as a 'professionalizer' (c.f. p.92), sets out a basis for teaching alongside the 'elite' professions. The preamble is strikingly similar to point one of 'Professionalism in Action' of the *Good Medical Practice* (GMC, 2014) for doctors:

> Patients need good doctors. Good doctors make the care of their patients their first concern: they are competent, keep their knowledge and skills up to date, establish and maintain

> good relationships with patients and colleagues, are honest and trustworthy, and act with integrity.
>
> *Good Medical Practice*, General Medical Council (updated edition) (GMC, 2014, p.4). An earlier 2012 edition, with the same text as above, was cited in a book by Roy Blatchford (Review Group Deputy Chair) (Blatchford, 2013, p.9).
>
> Teachers make the education of their pupils their first concern, and are accountable for achieving the highest possible standards in work and conduct. Teachers act with honesty and integrity; have strong subject knowledge, keep their knowledge and skills as teachers up-to-date and are self-critical; forge positive professional relationships; and work with parents in the best interests of their pupils.
>
> Preamble to the *Teachers' Standards* (DfE, 2012b).

The Preamble to the TS attempts to align teaching with elite professions such as medicine while at the same time reinforcing the identified economic 'moral cause' of the pedagogic discourse. This presents a conflict within the text of the Preamble. While there is an attempt to align teaching, or the virtuous teacher (c.f. p.21), with the moral basis of medicine, there is still reference to a performance element of teaching and the 'effective' teacher. Teachers are expected to be 'self-critical' which is potentially a reference to the 'reflective' teacher (c.f. p.23).

Examination of the TS reveals elements of competing discourses within the pedagogic discourse, particularly the regulatory discourse, of the Review. While the dominate discourse is one of performance and the effective teacher, aimed at pushing the teacher towards the restricted end of Hoyle's (1974) continuum, with the moral cause being the individual economic betterment of the child, there are elements of the virtuous teacher with the 'first concern' being for pupils' education.

8.2.2 The importance of subject knowledge

Through analysis of speeches by the then Secretary of State, Michael Gove MP (Gove, 2010; 2011), the *Schools White Paper* (DfE, 2010b), the *ITT Implementation Plan* (DfE, 2011h) and quotes attributed to the Minister for Schools (Williams, 2010), it is clear that the Government identified subject matter knowledge (Grossman, 1990) as the principal form of knowledge required for teaching and of teachers. This approach is consistent with New Right thinking, and particularly of Review Group member Anthony O'Hear, in identifying subject matter knowledge as the principal theoretical knowledge for teaching.

Although no teacher would wish to have a poor or even only adequate subject knowledge, this characterisation of subject knowledge, as the principal form of knowledge for teaching, did not directly translate into the TS themselves. While it would

be impractical to have a standard for each area of subject knowledge on the school curriculum, subject knowledge is covered only by a single standard in the final text of the TS:

> **3. Demonstrate good subject and curriculum knowledge**
> - have a secure knowledge of the relevant subject(s) and curriculum areas, foster and maintain pupils' interest in the subject, and address misunderstandings
> - demonstrate a critical understanding of developments in the subject and curriculum areas, and promote the value of scholarship
> - demonstrate an understanding of and take responsibility for promoting high standards of literacy, articulacy and the correct use of standard English, whatever the teacher's specialist subject
> - if teaching early reading, demonstrate a clear understanding of systematic synthetic phonics.
>
> Standard 3, *Teachers' Standards* (DfE, 2012b).

The heading for this standard (Demonstrate good subject and curriculum knowledge) is consistent with the view of subject knowledge held by the Government in that it restricts itself to the 'what' of teaching. Effectively, it largely disregards the idea of Shulman's 'pedagogic content knowledge' (Shulman, 1987) in excluding the 'how' of subject teaching. However, in the accompanying bullet points, there is recognition and acceptance of differences with this view. For example, teachers are encouraged to 'demonstrate a critical understanding' which suggests some form of engagement in enquiry or research. Additionally, reference is made to 'addressing misunderstandings' which would require teachers to have some knowledge of how children learn.

What is striking is the clear reference to the use of Systematic Synthetics Phonics (SSP) with the final bullet of Standards 3 – 'if teaching early reading, demonstrate a clear understanding of systematic synthetic phonics' (DfE, 2012b). First, the bullet point is presented as familiar and uncontroversial and presupposes universal acceptance of SSP. This is despite questions over the effectiveness of SSP and associated assumptions (S. Ellis & Moss, 2014).

Second, it is very much in line with the Government's backing of and narrative around SSP (DfE, 2011b). However, crucially, the standard states that teachers must 'demonstrate a clear understanding' of this particular pedagogy but stops short of instructing its use in classrooms. From the interview data, it emerged that this was modified to acknowledge that SSP is not universally used in the Independent School Sector. Hence, despite the unequivocal discourse around the use of SSP, in this instance the TS took on a negotiated existence against the wishes of the state.

Lamnias (2002) would recognise this as an instance of 'alternative orders' (c.f. p.34) where the intentions of the state are modified by the agents of the ORF.

Many (Cox, Douglas-Home et al., 1989; O'Hear, 1988) have looked to the combination of subject matter knowledge with craft knowledge as the key elements required of teachers. This is where the analysis will now focus.

8.2.3 From craft knowledge to competence: developing a transient profession

Previously, the conflation of performance and competency orientations for teachers in the pedagogic discourse of the Review has been highlighted (c.f. p.105). The focus now falls on the notion of the craft knowledge teacher (c.f. p.20) within the TS. Successive UK Governments have championed craft knowledge (Gove, 2010; TDA, 2008) as the principal knowledge, other than subject matter knowledge, required by teachers. The popularity of such an approach by policy makers has seen the theoretical and enquiring accounts of teacher preparation side-lined in favour of more on-the-job 'training'. This was evident at the start of the coalition Government in 2010:

> Teaching is a craft and it is best learnt as an apprentice observing a master craftsman or woman. Watching others, and being rigorously observed yourself as you develop, is the best route to acquiring mastery in the classroom. Which is why I also intend to abolish those rules which limit the ability of school leaders to observe teachers at work. Nothing should get in the way of making sure we have the best possible cadre of professionals ready to inspire the next generation.
>
> Michael Gove MP speech to the *National College for Leadership of Schools and Children's Services* (NCSL) Annual Conference 2010 (Gove, 2010).

This section of Gove's speech starts by introducing classroom-craft as a well-established truth. This is an attempt to make universal the identification of teaching solely with craft knowledge. There is nothing dialogical about this statement as there is no opportunity for alternative conceptions of teaching. There is the characterisation of craft knowledge acquisition as something developed by observing other practitioners and being subjected to 'rigorous' observation oneself. Clearly, having the opportunity to observe other more experienced practitioners would be a key component of developing Polanyi's (1958) connoisseurship (c.f. p.21).

While on the one hand teaching as a craft is presented as being something familiar, the third sentence (which is why I also intend to abolish those rules which limit the ability of school leaders to observe teachers at work) is linked to conceptions of teaching as a performance or a collection of observable competences. Teaching cannot be both craft knowledge and competency based as Polanyi (1958) points out the difficulty of

applying objectivity to matters of connoisseurship. By this he means that craft knowledge cannot be reduced to a series of statements or competencies.

There is a fundamental difficulty with combining craft knowledge, with its tacit dimension developed over many years, with those of competence-based education and training (Lum, 1999) based on reductive and technical foundations, aimed at a minimum level of competence for all practitioners. When this was put to a former advisor to Michael Gove there did not seem to be a distinction made between craft and competence:

> I think that when people talk about craft they mean; they're referring to a set of competencies anyway. So, it's a bit of a false distinction I think.
>
> Interview 5 (England).

The appeal of having exacting competencies for teachers is attractive and forms the basis for the existence of teaching standards in the first place. However, such a conflation between craft, competence and performance would suggest a degree of policy incoherence around the exact nature of professional knowledge for teachers.

A further appeal of the craft knowledge teacher is the downgrading of theoretical and empirically derived forms of knowledge and the potential for reducing the barriers for entry into the profession. Together with a desire to simplify the content of the TS, such deregulation frames teaching as a transient profession, where people can move freely in and out from other occupations as opposed to teaching as a life-task.

In an influential report by the right leaning Policy Exchange think tank entitled *More Good Teachers* (Freedman, Lipson et al., 2008), the notion of teaching as almost a national service was proposed as a way of addressing teacher recruitment shortfalls. This theme clearly had influence in Government as a former policy advisor pointed out:

> So, you could try and force teaching into the four years of training bracket, the medicine or law model. But the evidence is that graduates would not be prepared to go down that route in any great numbers possibly because the pay for being and doctor or lawyer is so much higher over a lifetime of earnings. You could create a sense of teacher professionalism which is a strong thing to have on your CV, that it's a really difficult job, it builds a lot of skills and it's something that's hard to get into because it's competitive. If you've got those things, then that will build professional status without having to have that permanent career structure.
>
> Interview 5 (England).

The clear narrative is that there is potentially a cohort of recruits who could be attracted into the classroom for a limited number of years based on a combination of altruistic

and skill development reasons. This is very much the model that has been adopted by Teach First in seeking a two-year commitment from participants (Brett Wigdortz, the founder and CEO of Teach First was a member of the Review.

By simplifying the requirements for entry into the profession and requiring a short inductive period to achieve functional level of operations in the classroom, graduates should be able to transfer in and out of teaching with relative ease. Beyond this surface level of competence, ideally there should be no need for a significantly higher level of capability, only doing the fundamental elements better before possibly transferring to another occupation. This contrasts sharply with the characterisation in Scotland of teaching as a complex and career-long occupation.

8.2.4 Part 2 of the Teachers' Standards: sledgehammer and nut?

Part 2 of the *Teachers' Standards*, which replaced the 15-page *Code of Conduct and Practice for Register Teachers* (GTCE, 2009), was predominantly developed by officials at the Department for Education (DfE) (c.f. p.109) and is now used to 'assess cases of serious misconduct' (DfE, 2012b, p.2). This part of the TS is considerably reduced in size from the Code of Conduct taking up half a page and consisting of three statements. One of the statements referred to the conduct of teachers in school:

> Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
>
> Extract from Part 2 of the *Teachers' Standards* (DfE, 2012b).

As Tom Hamilton, the Director of Education at the GTC Scotland pointed out, the notion of 'proper and professional regard' is ambiguous:

> …but how is "proper and professional regard" to be defined and identified? If a teacher argues against a school policy from a well researched, fully considered and professional viewpoint could he or she be accused of not showing proper regard?
>
> Response of Tom Hamilton (GTC Scotland) to *Proposed changes to the teacher disciplinary and induction regulations following the abolition of the General Teaching Council for England* (Hamilton, 2011).

In addition to statements relating to teachers' professional conduct, this section of the TS is underpinned by the threat associated with radicalisation, particularly where reference is made to 'fundamental British values'. This identified purpose for Part 2 means that the TS as a whole adopts an appraisal and disciplinary function towards teachers' professional values and conduct:

Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by:

- treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
- having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
- not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect, and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs
- ensuring that personal beliefs are not expressed in ways which exploit pupils' vulnerability or might lead them to break the law.

Selected extracts[24] from Part 2 of the *Teachers' Standards* (DfE, 2012b).

Bryan locates the teachers identified through Part 2 in the 'post secular context' (Bryan, 2012, p.227). Within this she recognises 'fundamental British values[25]' as a blurring between the secular state and Christianity and she questions the morality of subjecting these standards to performance measures. There is quite clearly a tension in merging standards for conduct with those for values as they become just about disciplinary matters (Hamilton, 2011). The propositional assumption is that part of the work of teachers is to 'not undermine British values' and act to prevent radicalisation. However, this could appear to contradict the notion of 'building relationships rooted in mutual respect' if the identity of the teacher is both confidant and informant.

What is undisputed is the need for a set of normative rules or principles characterising the sorts of behaviours expected of teachers which would naturally reside in a code of conduct. However, Carr draws to our attention the distinctiveness of a teachers' role in developing pupils moral development (c.f. virtuous teacher, p.21) and he argues strongly for a form of 'moral education' as opposed to forms of 'social control' (Carr, 2006, p.177). This presents an inherent difficulty when merging codes of conduct with teaching standards as statements relating to moral education, and for moral educators, do not naturally lend themselves to be written as rules.

One member of the Review identified a degree of heavy-handedness with the text of Part 2:

---

[24] These extracts were selected based on their reference to 'fundamental British values'.

[25] Interestingly this is referred to as 'British values' despite the fact that the *Teachers' Standards* are for only teachers in England. No reference is made to them in the *Professional Standards for Techers* in Scotland.

> I think that there was a political agenda around teachers' professionalism. Doing something with the GCTE code of conduct and not letting that slide – fine, but the particular areas they wanted to focus on and bring in, particularly the British values side of things, was to deal with a specific school in specific circumstances. And when you have something as general as personal and professional conduct to address these concerns - it's sledge hammer and nut. I don't know if it will work. I don't know if it is the hook on which you can hang the Jihadist or BNP activist.
>
> Interview 1 (England).

Although this quote was not a majority view expressed in the interview data, it does provide an insight from someone who was not a head-teacher and someone who was selected by their representing institution rather than the DfE directly. This member of the Review expressed concern about the TS being used to address specific concerns around radicalisation. This suggests that the balance is tipped towards a code of conduct and compliance rather than an expression of professional values.

What has become clear is several competing discourses associated with the development the pedagogic discourse and final text of the TS. While the transitory teacher in England is predominately identified as compliant and focused on economic goals, there are elements of professionalization and comparisons with elite professions. On the whole however, the TS in England can be regarded as largely as a 'regulatory' set of standards (Sachs, 2005) as they attempt to push teachers towards the restricted end of Hoyle's (1974) continuum.

8.3 The 'developmental' *Professional Standards for Teachers* in Scotland

Scottish education has sustained a period of incremental change during the last ten years with policy initiatives largely leading from the ongoing implementation of *Curriculum for Excellence* (Scottish Executive, 2004). With the impetus for the revision[26] of PST emanating from *Teaching Scotland's Future* (Donaldson, 2011), Donaldson expressed the view, in contrast to those expressed in England, that craft knowledge for teachers, by itself, was insufficient for the demands of classroom practice. This view was widely held throughout Scottish education:

> Teaching needs to be evidence based: teachers need to study what is known about how pupils think, develop and are to be motivated to learn, about the barriers to learning and much else besides. Arguably, the personal knowledge associated with the learning of a craft has to be complemented by the

[26] Donaldson was at pains to point out that there should be a revision of the existing suite of professional standards and not a wholescale review of what was already in place.

> broader knowledge that comes from the review and study of existing academic evidence about the conduct of teaching.
>
> *It's not craft or profession. Teachers without both skills will be a walking disaster* by Gordon Kirk (Kirk, 2011).
>
> The 'craft' components of teaching must be based upon and informed by fresh insights into how best to meet the increasingly fast pace of change in the world which our children inhabit. Simply advocating more time in the classroom as a means of preparing teachers for their role is therefore not the answer to creating better teachers. The nature and quality of that practical experience must be carefully planned and evaluated and used to develop understanding of how learning can best be promoted in sometimes very complex and challenging circumstances.
>
> Extract from *Teaching Scotland's Future* (Donaldson, 2011, p.4-5).

While acknowledging an alternative conception for teachers' professional knowledge, Donaldson disregards the notion of solely classroom-based preparation for teachers, and by implication notions of reflecting on events as they happen, or reflection-in-action (Schön, 1983), on the grounds that it is insufficient for 'the increasingly fast pace of change in the world which our children inhabit'. The propositional assumption here is that the sort of approach being adopted in England, where the initial preparation of teachers is characterised by the immersion in the activity of teaching, does not fit the model for teaching he wishes to see developed in Scotland.

His vision for teacher education is more akin to Schön's (1983) reflection-on-action where thinking and evaluation of teaching activities taking place afterwards and away from the activity, for example, as an enquiring teacher (c.f. p.23). This vision for teacher education was to be followed through into the revised and integrated[27] PST developed by the GTC Scotland incorporating standards for entry into the profession, standards for experienced teachers and standards for those engaged in school leadership. In addition, for those teachers already registered with the GTC Scotland, there is to be an annual system of appraisal called Professional Update (c.f. p.30).

In structuring teacher accreditation and development, the PST take the form of three different documents. First, the *Standards for Registration* (GTCS, 2012h), which incorporates the Standard for Provisional Registration and the Standard for Full Registration, acts as a benchmark and sets the tone for entry into teaching, and when met, confers full registration for a teacher with the GTC Scotland. This document consists of 19 pages of which 16 pages are taken up with the standards themselves.

[27] Previously, the Professional Standards had been developed at different times and in separate drafting and review processes.

Then, the *Standard for Career-Long Professional Learning* (GTCS, 2012f) is designed for teachers beyond the initial preparatory years and assumes the teacher has achieved a basic level of competence covered by the entry Standards. The changing purpose and priority for the professional Standards as a teacher progresses through their career are seen as an important feature of this Standard which is reflected in the more dialogical style of the statements.

Finally, there are *The Standards for Leadership and Management* (GTCS, 2012g) which outline the standard for middle and senior leadership positions.

Each set of standards follow a similar format in that the first section is concerned with 'Professional Values and Personal Commitments' and is identical in each document, forming a consistent thread through all the standards. Subsequent sections are concerned with professional knowledge, understanding and actions. Aileen Kennedy (2016, p.116) notes that the PST represent 'multiple underpinning purposes', including benchmark for competence and a framework for planned professional learning, despite their presentation as a 'suite' of professional standards.

This chapter will now go on to discuss the forms of professional knowledge presented in the PST before considering teacher identity. It is the first two of this set of teaching standards that will be subject to analysis as these are the standards that are directly comparable to the TS in England.

8.3.1 'The Scottish Teacher': facing two ways

A core element of the revised PST is a particular focus on the values expected of teachers in Scotland. The identical two-page section entitled 'Professional Values and Personal Commitments', authored outside the main Writing Groups, is located in each of the three professional standards documents.

Following an introductory section, which contains a definition of Professional Values and Personal Commitments, there are four identified core themes: social justice, integrity, trust and respect, and professional commitment. Each has accompanying explanatory bullet points which are broadly linked to identified longstanding aims for education in Scotland based around concepts of social justice, inclusion and citizenship (Raffe & Byrne, 2005). However, despite the continued commitment to these values in the PST, there is an attempt to also frame 'The Scottish Teacher' (c.f. p.100) as an agent of change in the context of globalisation. For example, under the heading 'Social Justice' there are five bullet points, two of which are listed below, which make reference to concepts of 'global citizenship', 'real world issues' and a 'better future' for the 'Scottish learner':

- Valuing as well as respecting social, cultural and ecological diversity and promoting the principles and practices of local and global citizenship for all learners.
- Demonstrating a commitment to engaging learners in real world issues to enhance learning experiences and outcomes, and to encourage learning our way to a better future.

Extracts from *Professional Values and Commitments* section of the PST (GTCS, 2012f, p.6; 2012g, p.6; 2012h, p.6).

There are several assumptions housed within these bullet points including the actual existence of 'global citizenship', that there are such things as 'real world issues' and that learning is the sole route to a 'better future'. The much disputed concept of 'global citizenship' is not only difficult to define, but presents significant pedagogical problems. From the statement on Professional Values and Personal Commitments, it is not clear whether global citizenship is in some way a celebration of universal human rights and concern for issues such as the environment, health, peace and security, or more sinisterly, a hegemonic attempt to transcend national borders and governments to corporatise the world and its citizens (Rapoport, 2015).

The promotion of local and global citizenship implies there are two forms of identity for Scottish learners: first, a more traditional engagement in local communities around themes of social justice and citizenship; and second, a form of identity that is orientated towards workplace norms and is responding to 'change' (c.f. p.79) brought about by the pressure of globalisation. Such a recognition and acceptance of difference are resolved by attempting to have 'The Scottish Teacher' facing both ways: towards the local community and towards the globalised market place.

In contrast to the approach taken in England, Scottish teachers are encouraged to 'acknowledge' socioeconomic backgrounds of learners. Under the heading 'Trust and Respect' there are three bullet points of which one is listed below which acknowledges socioeconomic backgrounds:

- Demonstrating a commitment to motivating and inspiring learners, acknowledging their social and economic context, individuality and specific learning needs and taking into consideration barriers to learning.

Extracts from *Professional Values and Commitments* section of PST (GTCS, 2012f, p.6; 2012g, p.6; 2012h, p.6).

The language used here is one of 'motivate and inspire' as opposed to 'stretch and challenge' used in England which does rely more on the affective character (Carr, 2007) of individual teachers and concern for the individual child. This in itself is closer to the virtuous teachers' (c.f. p.21) in so far as it relies on a personal form of knowledge

that informs actions. In effect, this section of the PST attempts to align the concepts related to globalisation with Scottish educational cultural values to provide a blueprint for moral action.

Elsewhere within the statement there are attempts to reconcile teachers own personal beliefs with those of the education system at large. Under the heading 'Integrity' there are three bullet points, of which one is listed below, which attempts to do this:

> - Critically examining the connections between personal and professional attitudes and beliefs, values and practices to effect improvement and, when appropriate, bring about transformative change in practice.
>
> Extracts from Professional Values and Commitments section of the PST (GTCS, 2012f, p.6; 2012g, p.6; 2012h, p.6).

The statements do leave some room for alternatives with the concept of 'transformative change' probably referring to the transformative teacher (c.f. p.24) of Hoyle's (1974) extended professionality and Sachs' (2003a) activist professionalism. However, in linking values to practice, one head-teacher member of the revision of the PTS suggested a holistic conception for teaching standards:

> I didn't know why we compartmentalise the Standards because I don't think in schools we compartmentalise our profession, you know a teacher doesn't think in terms of their professional values and personal commitment as being separate from their teaching and learning capabilities I think they're all intertwined … I actually had a go at different drafts of totally overhauling it, I had discussions about whether we could do that, I still argued for a holistic overview of a teacher rather than sort of sections, we did try that and it just didn't work.
>
> Interview 1 (Scotland).

This head-teacher is dialogical in so far as he identifies and discusses an alternative conception before concluding that 'it just didn't work'. However, what it does suggest is the difficulty of separating, what Bernstein (2000) refers to as, regulatory discourse from instructional discourse. Both are intertwined: 'professional values and personal commitments' and 'teaching and learning capabilities'.

So far, 'The Scottish Teacher' is seen as requiring classroom craft and an identified set of 'Professional Values and Personal Commitments'. Previously, the concept of a 'critically informed adaptive expert' teacher in Scotland had been introduced and this theme is now considered in light of the text of the PST.

8.3.2 Craft and academic: the 'Scottish tradition'

As identified earlier (c.f. p.133), craft knowledge, although seen as being important, was in itself considered by Donaldson (2011) as being insufficient alone for the

demands of Scottish classrooms. His vision for a reconceptualised model (c.f. p.76) for teacher professionalism, based on Hoyle's (1974) 'extended professionality', appears to be well embedded across Scottish education. This notion identifies 'The Scottish Teacher' as a reflective and enquiring practitioner, responding to 'complex, dynamic contexts' (GTCS, 2014a).

Based on the interview data, it would appear that there is little objection to the GTC Scotland's call for 'critically informed *adaptive experts*[28]' (italics original) (GTCS, 2012i; 2014a). However, to understand how this Scottish model translates into professional knowledge there needs to be further examination of the text of the PST.

In *The Standards for Registration* (GTCS, 2012h) under the second section entitled 'Professional Knowledge and Understanding', student and registered teachers are expected to have knowledge and understanding of:

- the nature of the curriculum and its development;
- planning coherent and progressive teaching programmes;
- contexts for learning to fulfil their responsibilities in literacy, numeracy, health and wellbeing and interdisciplinary learning;
- principles of assessment, recording and reporting;
- the principal features of the education system, educational policy and practice;
- the schools and learning communities in which they teach and their own professional responsibilities within them;
- relevant educational principles and pedagogical theories to inform professional practices;
- the importance of research and engagement in professional enquiry.

Extracts from *The Standards for Registration* (GTCS, 2012h, p. 7-12). These extracts are from different pages of the document and were selected based on the broad themes they represent.

The limited dialogical nature and compartmentalised format of these extracts fits with their role as professional entry standards for registration with the GTC Scotland. Although, similar areas are covered here as in the TS in England, there is far more detail about what teachers are expected to know, understand and do (this detail is not shown in the extract above due to this part of the Standards extending for six pages).

Their categorical nature (Fairclough, 2003, p.164) means there is little room for alternatives and the text is underpinned by a number of assumptions. For example, in

[28] This phrase is used by the GTC Scotland to encapsulate the type of teacher they envisage for Scotland as a result of the revised *Professional Standards for Teachers*.

the same way that the notion of engaging in educational research is excluded from the TS in England, the unquestioning acceptance of the 'importance of research' is present within the text of the PST. Hence, there is no acknowledgement of the reach or potential limitations of research in teaching (Barrow & Foreman-Peck, 2005) – the propositional assumption is that there are no limitations.

Despite this, based on the interview data, there is strong support for the notion of 'The Scottish Teacher' being an enquiring practitioner (c.f. p.20) as one member of the Writing Group 1 explained:

> There's also a strong academic influence in the emphasis that is put on research and if you look at it you will see things to do with enquiry and things to do with research, things to do with the familiarisation with educational literature, that features quite strongly in there and I think that mirrors an old Scottish tradition as we don't see teaching as a purely craft-based technique-based profession nor do we see it as an academic profession, it's this blend of the craft with the academic that creates 'The Scottish Teacher' and I think that the Standards reflect that quite well.
>
> Interview 4 (Scotland)

The use of the possessive 'I' identifies this head-teacher with 'The Scottish Teacher' identified by Donaldson. This combines the craft of teaching with academic engagement. This concept is so well embedded that it is referred to as a 'Scottish tradition'.

8.3.3 The 'adaptive expert'

The recommendation of a new 'Standard for Active Registration' (Donaldson, 2011, p.77)', actually conceived as the *Standard for Career-Long Professional Learning* (GTCS, 2012f), alongside a system of national reaccreditation called 'Professional Update', has been viewed as a movement towards 'refined' (Hulme & Menter, 2011, p.82) rather than reductive standards. This Standard, which replaced the *Standard for Chartered Teacher* (Scottish Executive, 2002), was the GTC Scotland's unique answer to Donaldson's 'reconceptualised model' (c.f. p.76).

In a similar way to the *Standards for Registration*, the standard has three sections covering professional values and personal commitment, professional knowledge and professional actions. However, teachers using this standard do not have to 'meet' the whole standard as they are permitted to focus on an individual aspect with the underlying assumption being that all teachers subscribe to the 'adaptive expert' concept:

> The teacher as an adaptive expert is open to change and engages with new and emerging ideas about teaching and

> learning within the ever-evolving curricular and pedagogical contexts in which teaching and learning takes place.
>
> From the introductory section of *The Standard for Career-Long Professional Learning* (GTCS, 2012f, p.4)

This more open-ended form does fall within the developmental style of standard (Sachs, 2003b; 2005) in projecting a vision for teacher development. Again, 'The Scottish Teacher' is presented with the concept of 'change' and the existential assumption is that this will be ever present – hence the need to be 'adaptive'.

In regards to being 'critical', there are two connotations of the term that is taken forward in PST. First, the sense of being research engaged or an enquiring practitioner; second, in adopting an enquiry approach to policy and practice (see next section). For example, under the enquiry and research key area, the identified professional actions include encouragement of forms of practitioner enquiry:

> **Enquiry and Research**
>
> - develop and apply expertise, knowledge and understanding of research and impact on education;
> - develop and apply expertise, knowledge, understanding and skills to engage in practitioner enquiry to inform pedagogy, learning and subject knowledge;
> - lead and participate in collaborative practitioner enquiry.
>
> Extract for the *Standard for Career-Long Professional Learning* (GTCS, 2012f, p.10).

This standard makes it quite clear that the mode of professional learning for teachers is through research and enquiry and that teachers should be developing a positive disposition towards academic engagement in education.

Whereas in England there has been a move to reduce the scope of the TS and identify teaching as an occupation that people transfer in and out of, teaching in Scotland is seen as a career-long occupation requiring collaboration with fellow professionals. As we have seen, the spirit of enquiry and reflection is present across the PST with student, as well as more experienced, teachers expected to be able to apply findings derived from educational research, which puts the PST very much within the developmental (Sachs, 2005) territory. This has clear implications for the professional identify of teachers in Scotland.

8.3.4 The 'empowered' Scottish Teacher

The PST have two broad implications for the identity of teachers in Scotland. First, there is the greater professional autonomy that accompanies more developmental teaching standards; second, there is a sense of 'critical' that advocates the teacher as 'activist' (Sachs, 2001; 2003a).

In regards to the first of these teacher identities, a strong theme developed from the interview data is associated with the PST empowering teachers as a collective occupational group:

> There is a very interesting dynamic that goes on here because perhaps there is a group that would see standards as a means of control and power to be used by managers; and there is another group, and this would be the GTC's view, that standards should actually empower teachers. And one of the ways we would like the standards to empower teachers is saying 'you need to be certainly reflective and an enquiring practitioner as well'. And being reflective means you have to think about your own actions and the actions of the system in general.
>
> Interview 4 (Scotland)

The discourse around this part of the standard clearly expresses Hoyle's (1974) extended professionalism with 'skills derived from mediation between experience and theory', 'regular reading of professional literature' and 'involvement in in-service work'. As this local authority official recognised, the sense of empowerment, and associated autonomy, emanates from the forms of collective professional knowledge developed through reflective and enquiring activities. However, in this extract, there is no attempt to acknowledge or reconcile the fact that teachers may be content to categories themselves within the 'effective' teacher model (Menter, Hulme et al., 2010) and not engage with the reflective or enquiring models (c.f. p.23).

Clearly, teachers are not being compelled to engage with the entire *Standard for Career-Long Professional Learning*. However, one member of the Writing Group for this Standard expressed concerns around the implications for teachers' professional learning and moves towards a Master's-led profession:

> Around that [enquiring teachers] I was very concerned about the future and the expectations were far too high for teachers who already had a degree of stress in their lives and certainly no time other than their own spare time to devote to the whole idea of Master's level learning but also to aspects of the new standard which was saying, in a roundabout fashion, they had to be 'a' learning and 'b' performing at Master's level in terms of academic ability.
>
> Interview 5 (Scotland).

This extracts suggests there is an assumption, present in the *Standards for Career-Long Professional Learning,* about the enthusiasm for academic study by large numbers of teachers across Scotland. The extract suggests that the main focus for teachers is on their day-to-day activities in the classroom and that there is no time for such studies outside the classroom. The fact that teacher enquiry is so prevalent across the PST would suggest that certain cohorts of teachers are being excluded from

shaping their own professional identity if they cannot or do not wish to engage in academic studies of teaching.

The second identify for teachers portrayed through PST is a different sense of being 'critical' similar to the activist professionalism advocated by Sachs (2001; 2003a). This is characterised by professionals working together in communities of practice, evaluating policies and practices, having an open flow of ideas and forming alliances across different educational and teacher institutions. This concept is clearly evident in the *Standard for Career-Long Professional Learning* which states:

> **Educational contexts and current debates in policy, education and practice**
>
> - understand and explore the contexts and complexity in which teachers operate and the dynamic and complex role(s) of professionals within the educational community;
> - actively consider and critically question the development(s) of policy in education;
> - develop culture where learners meaningfully participate in decisions related to their learning and school;
> - develop and apply political literacy and political insight in relation to professional practice, educational change and policy development.
>
> *Standard for career-long professional learning* (GTCS, 2012f, p.10)

The call to 'critically question the development(s) of policy in education' advocates for an assertive form of professionalism and is in contrasts with the 'self-critical' approach for teachers adopted in the TS. There is an assumption that there would be background enthusiasm for such a conception and that the structures of Scottish education allow for such critical engagement.

8.4 Comparing the English and Scottish teacher

The 'moral cause' for education in England has seen the promotion of the 'effective' teacher in the TS with the development of pupils' 'intellectual capital' as the sole aim. Accompanied with this call has been a degree of incoherence around the exact nature of teachers' professional knowledge with classroom craft, competency and performance approaches all being advocated, sometimes as one and the same thing. 'The Scottish Teacher' in contrast, as depicted in the PST, is an informed operator who adopts a critical and enquiring approach to developing professional knowledge and 'faces both ways' towards globalisation and a more localised social justice.

The discourse of the TS, which is presented as combined standards and regulatory framework, seeks to bind teachers' moral purpose with the academic progress and attainment of the individual pupil while ensuring teachers conform to a series of values

including adhering to ‘fundamental British values’. The teacher is portrayed as a lone technician delivering the (National) Curriculum and adhering to national and school-based regulatory frameworks under a limited corpus of national standard ‘headings’ (the TS). Socio-economic backgrounds are seen as no barrier to a child’s ability to attain highly in public examinations. Such an approach pushes teacher professionalism towards the restricted end (Hoyle, 1974) resulting in regulatory teaching standards (Sachs, 2005).

The ‘critically adaptive’ teacher of the PST in Scotland, is multifaceted in so far as they are reflective and enquiring teachers and aspire to be transformative teachers firmly located at the extended end of Hoyle’s (1974) continuum. In addition, the statement on values outlines a far-reaching set of principles linked to social justice, trust and respect, and the need to exercise professional judgement, reinforces the notion of education as an entitlement (Ozga & Lingard, 2007) where the child’s socio-economic background is acknowledged. Such developmental teaching standards (Sachs, 2005) rely on the worth of educational research and enquiry in the face of the identified limitations (Barrow & Foreman-Peck, 2005).

Each set of teaching standards draw on conflicting forms of teachers’ professional knowledge and hence have differing conceptions of teachers occupational identify. The simplified version in England, aimed at reducing complexity associated with teaching, identifies teaching as a transitory occupation characterised by the practitioner moving in from and leaving to other occupations. Such a conception contrast with the career-long development framework advocated as part of the Scottish ‘tradition’ which forms a core element linking the various documents of the PST.

Chapter 9: Conclusion

The research set out with the aim of establishing the recontextualising principle and pedagogic discourse of the most recent reviews of teaching standards in England (2011) and Scotland (2012). Bernstein (1990; 2000) distinguishes between the two components of pedagogic discourse; regulatory discourse, which he says is a discourse of identity and social order, and instructional discourse, which contains skills and competencies. The former is dominant and embeds the latter. The recontextualising principle provides the regulation for the development of pedagogic discourse. Within these two broad aims were four research questions that tracked the context of discourse of the reviews from the global through to the national and onto the local context.

The first research question attempted to establish how the case was made for the existing teaching standards in England and Scotland to be reviewed. Both nations used international evidence to make the case for 'change'. The economic pressures of globalisation were used to argue for 'continuous improvement' in the quality of teaching. In England this led the Department for Education (DfE) to call for an immediate 'simplification' of the existing *Professional Standards for Teachers* (TDA, 2007) and implementation of performance orientations for teachers. The task of developing the new *Teachers' Standards* (herein referred to as the TS) was entrusted to the *Independent Review of Teachers' Standards* with the use of 'expert' authority as a device for legitimising the selection of the Review Group members drawn from a sub-set of the education sector. This contrasts to the situation in Scotland where the intention of the *Professional Standards for Teachers* (herein referred to as PST) was for a revision and updating, rather than a wholescale renewal. This was of the response to the recommendations of *Teaching Scotland's Future* (Donaldson, 2011, herein referred to as TSF), the review of teacher education carried out by Graham Donaldson. His recommendations, including the call for a 'recontextualised model' for teacher professionalism, were widely received uncritically (Scottish Government, 2012b) with more dissident voices (S. MacDonald, 2013) pushed to the margins. The legitimacy for the revision of the PST was tied up with democratic credentials of the GTC Scotland and interlocking committee structures of Scottish education as a form of 'institutional' authority (Fairclough, 2003, p.98).

The second research question continued to track the pedagogic context from the national to the local and focused on the recontextualising principles used to create the recontextualising field through the selection of Review and Writing Group members.

Neither review had stated aims or criteria for selecting the members of the Review and Writing Groups. In England there was an insulated Official Recontextualising Field (ORF) consisting of head-teachers and 'mediated' (Fairclough, 2003, p.187) educational 'experts', and a separated Professional Recontextualising Field (PRF) consisting of teaching unions and university departments of education. Selection to the Review was subject to a Ministerial veto. In contrast, the boundaries between the ORF and PRF were less clear in Scotland with an ORF that included most of the Scottish education institutions with the opposing PRF disorganised and pushed to the margins of policy making. This research suggests that this consensus has concentrated policy making in the hands of a 'policy elite' (Christie, 2003), which is not too dissimilar to the situation presented in England.

There were similarities across the two reviews of teaching standards in how they were regulated. This was the basis of the third research question. Each review was subject to strong classification (Bernstein, 2000) in so far as the remit for the revision of the PST in Scotland was tightly defined by TSF (Donaldson, 2011), and the revision of the TS in England was outlined in the Terms of Reference (DfE, 2011g). Whereas, in England, the Review of the TS was controlled by DfE officials as a form of 'classic bureaucracy' (Dimmock, 2007), including the pacing and sequencing of events, the GTC Scotland had a more 'informal' (ibid) structure to organising the Writing Groups. The emerging pedagogic discourse from the Review in England indicated a degree of policy incoherence in relation to the professional knowledge of teachers. With professionalization, deregulation and leaderism (O'Reilly & Reed, 2010; 2011) developing as competing ideological 'screens' (Bernstein, 2000) within the Review, the emanating pedagogic discourse conflated the 'economy of performance' (Stronach, Corbin et al., 2002) with craft knowledge and competency approaches. For example, this includes attempts to align the professional standing of teachers with that of doctors in the Preamble to the TS (c.f. p.126) while at the same time portraying teaching as a 'transient' profession (c.f. p.129). In Scotland, the rejection of craft knowledge as the sole basis for teaching has led to the creation of the 'critically informed adaptive expert' concept of teaching. The unquestioning acceptance of Donaldson's recommendations, and concepts of values, leadership and Learning for Sustainability, was seen by one Writing Group member as 'bounding the possibilities' with resistance to the 'recontextualised model' only considered at the consultation phase. The 'Scottish Teacher' was being asked to both adopt a critical stance while unquestioningly accepting the worth of educational research and enquiry in their day-to-day work.

The final research question was a culmination of the preceding three research questions in addressing the textual representation of the pedagogic discourse of the

reviews of teaching standards. The teacher portrayed through the TS in England is an 'effective' teacher with due regard for their own personal conduct very much within the context of their own school. This teacher may not necessarily view teaching as a career-long endeavour but as a transitory occupation from which they move onto other careers outside of teaching. Whereas in Scotland, the multi-faceted teacher depicted in the PST is effective, reflective and enquiring, with the standards themselves representing teaching as complex, challenging and enduring. Beyond the initial standards for entry into the profession, the Scottish 'critically informed adaptive' teacher is expected to question school policies, in contrast to their more passive and obedient English counterpart. Central to this discourse is the role of continuing professional development (CPD) plays en route to becoming an enquiring practitioner, with Scottish teachers encouraged to engage in the academic study of teaching. This contrasts with the TS in England which presents a simpler view of teaching where professional learning for teachers is viewed as a secondary requirement. Overall, what is represented here are teaching standards at the opposite ends of Hoyle's (1974) professionality continuum, with the TS in England located at the restricted end and the PST in Scotland representing something more extended.

In addressing the stated aims for this research, the regulatory discourse of the reviews of teaching standards in England and Scotland both referred to globalisation as a reason to have 'continued improvement'. While in England this led to a full embrace of notions of the 'economy of performance' (Ozga & Lingard, 2007; Stronach, Corbin et al., 2002), in Scotland there was a more tempered response that more readily accommodates social justice issues (Raffe & Byrne, 2005). In regards to instructional discourse there appears to be a degree of policy incoherence in England in regards to the exact nature of teachers' professional knowledge with performance, competency and craft knowledge presented as a one and the same. In Scotland, there has been acknowledgement that craft knowledge is insufficient for teachers' day-to-day activities. This has led to an unquestioning faith placed in the 'critically informed adaptive expert' model for 'The Scottish Teacher'. The recontextualising principles of the two reviews shared some similarities in relation to the key roles played by the DfE officials in England and the GTC Scotland officials. The ORF in England was tightly insulated from the PRF with strong 'framing' mediating the communication between the two. In Scotland, the GTC Scotland officials facilitated discourse from the National Partnership Groups to the PST Writing Groups with strong classification placed around knowledge associated with values, school leadership and 'Learning for Sustainability'.

In providing originality, this research has taken an extended approach to integrating the Pedagogic Device with Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). This included the

development of several questions for interrogating the text and linking with the Bernstein's theoretical apparatus. This was applied to the analysis of teaching standards and related documents to determine the workings of the reviews, a previously under-researched area. In regards to the data, the originality provided by accounts of those involved in the review processes enabled the identities of review group members to be established and their influence on the pedagogic discourse recognised. This depth of data obtained from the Review and Writing Groups is significant given the previously abandoned attempts to collect research data from participants of teaching standards reviews in England (Mahony & Hextall, 2000) and previously published research on teaching standards (Beck, 2009; Christie, 2003; Christie & Kirkwood, 2006) have mainly focused on the text of the teaching standards themselves.

Further research into the TS in England and PST in Scotland might be in the operationalization (Fairclough, 2005) of the two sets of standards. While the TS attempts to push teachers in England towards the restricted end of Hoyle's (1974) continuum and the PST in Scotland towards the extended end, the next research step might usefully investigate the nature of teaching across the two nations in light of the teaching standards.

Also, further research might consider ongoing development of teaching standards over time. Within the relatively stable institutions of Scottish education, there are identifiable processes of long-term developmental change which contrasts with the more politically sensitive development of policy in England. For instance, the interview data revealed that in Scotland there was a planned five-year cycle built into the standards reviewing process within a relatively stable political environment. Such planning could include, as was suggested by one interviewee in Scotland, seminars and training activities that 'build capacity' into the process to build expertise in how teaching standards are revised. However, in England, this is less clear, as teaching standards are more prone to changes in government policy as each differing administration has attempted to capture their own policy agendas within them. More recently, the *Teachers' Professional Development Expert Group* (DfE, 2015), a group that contains no review group members from the *Independent Review of Teachers' Standards*, developed the Standards for teachers' professional development (DfE, 2016). These standards mark a change from the TS in so far as they acknowledge a need for teachers' CPD. However, the selection processes for the *Expert Group* were similar to those used for the TS Review and the standards are intended to be non-statutory.

From the researcher's perspective, this research, and the Doctorate in Education programme, has enabled a critical approach to reading and writing about policy documents. The ability to synthesis large documentary evidence and communicate ideas effectively has been improved. This has been enhanced through a thorough exploratory use of CDA. Theoretical approaches, such as Bernstein's Pedagogic Device, have helped clarify thinking on a range of educational issues. In regards to the influence of day-to-day activities, the critical thinking associated with the EdD has promoted better decision making and the ability to explain complex concepts.

Bibliography and References

Adams, P. (2008). Considering 'best practice': The social construction of teacher activity and pupil learning as performance. *Cambridge Journal of Education* **38**(3): 375-392.

Alexander, R. (2011). *Review of Teachers' Standards, note from Professor Robin Alexander*. Cambridge, Cambridge Primary Review, University of Cambridge.

Alexiadou, N. and Ozga, J. (2002). Modernising Education Governance in England and Scotland: devolution and control *European Educational Research Journal* **1**(4).

ATL (2011). *DfE Review of Teachers' Standards, response from the Association of Teachers and Lecturers*. London, Association of Teachers and Lecturers.

Ball, S. J. (2003). The teacher's soul and the terrors of performativity. *Journal of Education Policy* **18**(2): 215-228.

Barber, M. and Mourshed, M. (2007). *How the world's best performing school systems come out on top*. London, McKinsey & Company.

Barbour, R. (1998). Mixing Qualitative Methods: Quality Assurance or Qualitative Quagmire? *Qualitative Health Research* **8**(3): 352-361.

Barrow, R. and Foreman-Peck, L. (2005). *IMPACT, What use is Educational Research? A debate*, Philospophy of Education Society of Great Britain.

Baumfield, V. (2012). *Action Research in Education: Learning Through Practitioner Enquiry*. London, SAGE Publications.

Beck, J. (2008). Governmental professionalsim: re-professionalising or de-professionalising teachers in England? *British Journal of Educational Studies* **56**(2): 119-143.

Beck, J. (2009). Appropriating professionalism: restructuring the official knowledge base of England's 'modernised' teaching profession. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* **30**(1): 3-14.

Benwell, B. and Stokoe, E. (2006). *Discourse and Identity*. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.

Bernstein, B. (1990). *Pedagogic Discourse Volume IV, Class, Codes and Control*. London and New York, Routledge.

Bernstein, B. (1996). *Pedagogy Symbolic Control and Identity, Theory, Research, Critique*. London, Taylor & Francis Ltd.

Bernstein, B. (2000). *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity*. New York & Oxford, Rowman & Littlefied Publishers.

Bertram, C. (2012). Bernstein's theory of the pedagogic device as a frame to study history curriculum reform in South Africa. *Yesterday and Today* **7**.

Blatchford, R. (2013). *The 2012 Teachers' Standards in the Classroom*. London, SAGE Publications.

Bloor, M. and Bloor, T. (2007). *The Practice of Critical Discourse Analysis, An Introduction*. London, Hodder Education.

Bradbury, H., Frost, N., Kilmister, S. and Zukas, M. (2010). *Beyond Reflective Practice: New Approaches to Professional Lifelong Learning*. London, Routledge.

Branscomb, L. M. (1986). *A nation prepared : teachers for the 21st century : the Report of the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, May 1986*. University of Minnesota, The Forum.

Breslin, T. (2002). *Chasing the wrong dream? The quest for teacher professionalism in the age of the citizenship school*. In *From victims of change to agents of change, The future of the teaching profession*. M. Johnson and J. Hallgarten. London, Institute for Public Policy Research.

Bryan, H. (2012). Reconstructing the teacher as a post secular pedagogue: a consideration of the new Teachers' Standards. *Journal of Beliefs and Values* **33**(2): 217-228.

BurlingtonDanes1699. (2011). "*Sally Coates and Quddus Akinwale at Conservative Party Conference*." Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DIU56kZPjcY (Accessed: 15 February 2016).

Carr, D. (2003). *Making Sense of Education, An Introduction to the Philosophy and Theory of Education and Teaching*. London, RoutledgeFalmer.

Carr, D. (2006). Professional and personal values and virtues in education and teaching. *Oxford Review of Education* **32**(2): 171-183.

Carr, D. (2007). Character in teaching. *British Journal of Educational Studies* **55**(4): 369-389.

Chouliaraki, L. (1998). Regulation in 'progressivist' pedagogic discourse: individualized teacher-pupil talk. *Discourse and Society* **9**(1): 5 - 32.

Chouliaraki, L. and Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.

Christie, D. (2003). *Benchmarks and Standards in Teaching*. In *Scottish Education (second edition)*. T. Bryce and W. Humes. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press**:** 845-854.

Christie, D. and Kirkwood, M. (2006). The new standards framework for Scottish teachers: facilitating or constraining reflective practice? *Reflective Practice* **7**(2): 265-276.

Coates, S. (2015). *Headstrong: 11 Lessons of School Leadership*. Woodbridge, John Catt Education Ltd.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2001). Reforming teacher education: competing agendas. *Journal of Teacher Education* **52**(4): 263-265.

Cochran-Smith, M. and Fries, M. (2001). Sticks, Stones, and Ideology: The Discourse of Reform in Teacher Education. *Educational Researcher* **30**(8): 3-15.

Codd, J. (2007). *The construction and deconstruction of educational policy documents*. In *Education, Globalisation and New TImes*. S. J. Ball, I. F. Goodson and M. Maguire. London, Routledge.

Coffield, F. (2012). Why the McKinsey report will not improve school systems. *Journal of Education Policy* **27**(1): 131-149.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2007). *Research Methods in Education*. 6 Ed. London, Routledge.

Connell, R. (2009). Good teachers on dangerous ground: towards a new view of teacher quality and professionalsim. *Critical Studies in Education* **50**(3): 213-229.

Cooke, S. (2013). *Virtues of the Good Teacher: Messages from literature, policy and practice The Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues, Insight Series*. Birmingham, University of Birmingham.

Cox, C., Douglas-Home, J., Marks, J., Norcross, L. and Scruton, R. (1989). *Learning to Teach*. *The Hillgate Group*. London, The Claridge Press.

CSPP (2013). *By Diverse Means: Improving Scottish Education*. Edinburgh, Centre for Scottish Public Policy.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1999). *Reshaping teaching policy, preparation and practice: Influences on the National Board for Teaching Professional Standards*. Washington, AACTE Publications.

DfE (2010a). *The Case for Change*. London, Department for Education.

DfE (2010b). *The Importance of Teaching, The Schools White Paper*. London, Department for Education.

DfE (2011a). *First Report of the Independent Review of Teachers' Standards*. London, Department for Education.

DfE (2011b). *Funding for phonics teaching to improve children's reading*. *Schools Minister announces matched funding scheme for phonics resources to drive up reading standards.* London, Department for Education.

DfE (2011c). *Letter from Nick Gibb MP, Minister of State for Schools, to Mr James Noble-Rogers, Executive Director, Universities' Council for the Education of Teachers*. London, Department for Education.

DfE (2011d). *Major overhaul of qualifications to raise the standard of teaching*. London, Department for Education.

DfE (2011e). *New standards raise the bar for teachers*. London, Department for Education.

DfE (2011f). *Second Report of the Independent Review of Teachers' Standards*. London, Department for Education.

DfE (2011g). *Terms of Reference for the Review of Teachers' Standards*. London, Department for Education.

DfE (2011h). *Training our next generation of outstanding teachers - Implementation plan*. London, Department for Education.

DfE. (2012a). "*Academies to have same freedom as Free Schools over teachers*." Available at: http://www.education.gov.uk/inthenews/inthenews/a00212396/academies-to-have-same-freedom-as-free-schools-over-teachers (Accessed: 15th March 2016).

DfE (2012b). *Teachers' Standards*. London, Department for Education.

DfE (2014). *Teachers' Standards, appraisal regulations and pay reform*. London, Department of Education.

DfE. (2015). "*Teachers' Professional Development Expert Group*." Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/groups/teachers-professional-development-expert-group (Accessed: 13th February 2016).

DfE (2016). *Standard for teachers' professional development*. London, Department for Education.

DfEE (1997). *Circular 10/97:Teaching:high status, high standards*. London, DfEE.

DfEE (1998). *Teachers - Meeting the Challenge of Change*. London, Department of Education and Employment.

DfES (2002). *The Standards Framework*. London, Department for Education and Schools.

Dimmock, C. (2007). *Comparing Educational Organisations*. In *Comparative Education Research, Approaches and Methods*. M. Bray, B. Adamson and M. Mason. Hong Kong, Springer.

Doherty, R. A. and McMahon, M. A. (2007). Politics, change and compromise: restructuring the work of the Scottish teacher. *Educational Review* **59**(3): 251 - 265.

Donaldson, G. (2011). *Teaching Scotland's Future, report of a review of teacher education in Scotland*. Edinburgh, The Scottish Government.

Donaldson, G. (2012). *Supporting and strengthening the quality of teaching*. *Holyrood Conference on Teacher Education*. Edinburgh.

Donaldson, G. (2015a). *Beyond improvement*. *British Educational Research Association Annual Conference, 15th-17th September 2015*. Belfast.

Donaldson, G. (2015b). "*Donaldson Education Services Ltd* " Available at: http://www.graham-donaldson.com/ (Accessed: 15th February 2016).

Dowling, P. (2007). "*Treacherous Departures*." Available at: http://www.pauldowling.me/publications/Chapter%204.pdf (Accessed: 15th February).

Driver, E. (2003). *Using Semi-Structured Interviews in Small-Scale Research, A Teacher Guide*. Glasgow, The SCRE Centre University of Glasgow.

Dunne, J. (1993). *Back to the Rough Ground, Practical Judgement and the Lure of Technique*. Notre Dame, Indiana, University of Notre Dame Press.

Education Scotland. (2016). "*How was the curriculum developed?*" Available at: http://www.educationscotland.gov.uk/thecurriculum/whatiscurriculumforexcellence/howwasthecurriculumdeveloped/index.asp (Accessed: 15th February 2016).

EIS (2012). *Consultation on the Review of GTC Scotland Professional Standards*. Edinburgh, The Educational Institute of Scotland.

Ellis, S. and Moss, G. (2014). Ethics, education policy and research: the phonics question reconsidered. *British Educational Research Journal* **40**(2): 241 - 260.

Ellis, V. and Orchard, J., Eds. (2014). *Learning Teaching from Experience*. London, Bloomsbury Academic.

Etzoni, A., Ed. (1969). *The Semi-Professions and Their Organization, Teachers, Nurses, Social Workers*. London, Collier Macmillan Publishers.

Evans, L. (2008). Professionalism, Professionality and the Development of Educational Professionals. *British Journal of Educational Studies* **56**(1): 20-37.

Evans, L. (2011). The 'shape' of teacher professionalism in England: professionals standards, performance management, professional development and the changes proposed in the 2010 White Paper. *British Educational Research Journal* **37**(5): 851-870.

Fairclough, N. (1996). A reply to Henry Widdowson's 'Discourse analysis: a critical view'. *Language and Literature* **5**(1): 49-56.

Fairclough, N. (2000). *New Labour, New Language*. London, Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power*. 2nd Ed. Harlow, Pearson Education Limited.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse. Textural analysis for social research*. London, Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (2005). Discourse Analysis in Organization Studies: The Case for Critical Realism. *Organisational Studies* **26**(6): 915-939.

Finn, A. and Hamilton, T. (2013). *The General Teaching Council for Scotland: An Independent Professional Body*. In *Scottish Education Fourth Edition: Referendum*. T. Bryce, W. Humes, D. Gillies and A. Kennedy. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press**:** 964-973.

Fontana, B. (2009). *Power and democracy, Gramsci and hegemony in America*. In *Perspectives on Gramsci: Politics, Culture and Social Theory*. J. Francese. London, Routledge.

Fox, A. (2009). *Leading Collaborative Professional Enquiry: Implications for Teachers, Chartered Teachers and their Managers* Doctorate in Education, University of Stirling.

Freedman, S. (2008). 'Good teachers are made in the classroom', *The Independent*, 1st August. (Accessed 3rd March 2016).

Freedman, S., Lipson, B. and Hargreaves, D. (2008). *More Good Teachers*. London, Policy Exchange.

Furlong, J. (2002). Ideology and Reform in Teacher Education in England: Some Reflections on Cochran-Smith and Fries *Educational Researcher* **31**(6): 23-25.

Furlong, J. (2005). New Labour and Teacher Education: the end of an era. *Oxford Review of Education* **31**(1): 119 - 134.

Glazer, N. (1974). The Schools of the Minor Professions. *Minerva* **12**(3): 326 - 345.

GMC (2014). *Good Medical Practice*. Manchester, General Medical Council.

Gorard, S. and Taylor, C. (2004). *Combining Methods in Educational and Scoial Research*. Maidnehead, Open University Press.

Gove, M. (2010). "*Michael Gove speech to the National College Annual Conference, 25th November 2010*." Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/michael-gove-to-the-national-college-annual-conference-birmingham (Accessed: 15th February 2016).

Gove, M. (2011). "*Michael Gove on the moral purpose of school reform: speech to the National College for School Leadership in Birmingham on 16 June 2011*." Available at:

https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/michael-gove-on-the-moral-purpose-of-school-reform (Accessed: 15th February 2016).

Grimmett, P. P. and MacKinnon, A. M. (1992). Craft Knowledge and the Education of Teachers. *Review of Research in Education* **18**: 385-456.

Grossman, P. L. (1990). *The making of a teacher, teacher knowledge and teacher education*. London, Teachers College Press.

Groundwater-Smith, S. and Sachs, J. (2002). The Activist Professional and the Reinstatement of Trust. *Cambridge Journal of Education* **32**(3): 341-358.

GTCE (2009). *Code of Conduct and Practice for Registered Teachers*. Birmingham, General Teaching Council for England.

GTCS (2006a). *Scottish subject benchmark statement, The Standard for Initial Teacher Education*. Glasgow, General Teaching Council for Scotland.

GTCS (2006b). *The Standard for Full Registration*. Edinburgh, General Teaching Council for Scotland.

GTCS (2006c). *Standard for Initial Teacher Education*. Edinburgh, General Teaching Council for Scotland.

GTCS (2011). *Minutes of the meeting of the Twelfth General Teaching Council*. Clerwood House, Edinburgh, General Teaching Council for Scotland.

GTCS (2012a). *Code of Professionalism and Conduct*. Edinburgh, General Teaching Council for Scotland.

GTCS (2012b). *Draft - Standards for Leadership and Management*. Edinburgh, GTC Scotland.

GTCS (2012c). *Draft - The Standard for Career-Long Professional Learning*. Edinburgh, GTC Scotland.

GTCS (2012d). *Draft - The Standards for Registration*. Edinburgh, GTC Scotland.

GTCS (2012e). *Report on Consultation on the Revision of the Standards*. Edinburgh, General Teaching Council for Scotland.

GTCS (2012f). *The Standard for Career-Long Professional Learning: supporting the development of teacher professional learning*. Edinburgh, The General Teaching Council for Scotland.

GTCS (2012g). *The Standards for Leadership and Management: supporting leadership and management development*. Edinburgh, General Teaching Council for Scotland.

GTCS (2012h). *The Standards for Registration: mandatory requirements for Registration with the General Teaching Council for Scotland*. Edinburgh, General Teaching Council for Scotland.

GTCS (2012i). *Statement for Review of Professional Standards*. Edinburgh, General Teaching Council for Scotland.

GTCS. (2014a). "*About the Standards*." Available at: http://www.gtcs.org.uk/standards/about-the-standards.aspx (Accessed: 15th February 2016).

GTCS (2014b). *Professional Update Guidance Notes*. Edinburgh, General Teaching Council for Scotland.

GTCS. (2015). "*Independence*." Available at: http://www.gtcs.org.uk/about-gtcs/independence.aspx (Accessed: 15th February 2016).

Habermas, J. (1979). *Legitimation Problems in the Modern State*. In *Communication and the Evolution of Society*. J. Habermas. Boston, Beacon Press.

Hall, S. and O'Shea, A. (2013). Common-sense neoliberalism. *Soundings*(55): 9 - 25.

Hamilton, T. (2011). *Proposed changes to the teacher disciplinary and induction regulations following the abolition of the General Teaching Council for England , response from the GTCS*. Edinburgh, General Teacher Council for Scotland.

Hammersley, M. (2007). The issue of quality in qualitative research. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education* **30**(3): 287 - 305.

Hatton, N. and Smith, D. (1995). Reflection in Teacher Education: Towards Definition and Implementation. *Teaching and Teacher Education* **11**(1): 33-49.

Heilbronn, R. (2008). *Teacher Education and the Development of Practical Judgement*. London, Continuum.

HM Treasury (2003). *Every Child Matters*. Her Majesty's Treasury. London, TSO.

Hoey, M. (2001). *Textual interaction: an introduction to written discourse analysis*. London & New York, Routledge.

Hoyle, E. (1974). Professionality, professionalism and control in teaching. *London Educational Review* **3**(2): 13-19.

Hulme, M. and Kennedy, A. (2016). *Teacher education in Scotland : Consensus politics and 'the Scottish policy style'*. In *Teacher education in times of change: Responding to challenges across the UK and Ireland*. G. Beauchamp, L. Clarke, M. Hulme et al. Bristol, Policy Press.

Hulme, M. and Menter, I. (2011). South and North - Teacher Education Policy in England and Scotland: a comparative texual analysis. *Scottish Educational Review* **43**(2): 70-90.

Husbands, C. (2013). "*Great teachers or great teaching? Why McKinsey got it wrong*." Available at: https://ioelondonblog.wordpress.com/2013/10/10/great-teachers-or-great-teaching-why-mckinsey-got-it-wrong/ (Accessed: 15 February 2016).

Johnston, R. and Watson, J. (2005). *The effects of synthethic phonics teaching on reading and spelling attainment: a seven year longitudinal study*. Edinburgh, SEED.

Kang, M. O. (2014). *Multicultural Education in South Korea: Language, Ideology, and Culture in Korean language arts education*. London, Routledge.

Kennedy, A. (2016). *Standards and accountability in teacher education*. In *Teacher education in times of change: Responding to challenges across the UK and Ireland.* G. Beauchamp, L. Clarke, M. Hulme et al. Bristol, Policy Press**:** 143-160.

Kirk, G. (2011). "*It's not craft or profession. Teachers without both skills will be a walking disaster*." Available at: http://www.tes.co.uk/article.aspx?storycode=6069934 (Accessed: 15th February 2016).

Kleinhenz, E. and Ingvarson, L. (2007). *Standards for Teaching: Theoretical Underpinnings and Applications*. Wellington, New Zealand Teachers Council.

Knodel, P., Windzio, M. and Martens, K. (2014). *Introduction: Outcomes and Actors' Reactions on Internationaliszation in Education Policy - A Theoretical Approach*. In *Internationalization of Education Policy, A Constellation of Statehood in Education*. P. Knodel, M. Windzio and K. Martens. Basingstoke, Paulgrave Macmillan.

Kvale, S. and Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Interviews, Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing*. 2 Ed. London, SAGE Publications.

Lamnias, C. (2002). The Contemporary Pedagogic Device: functional impositions and limitations. *Pedagogy, culture and society* **10**(1).

Larson, M. S. (1977). *The Rise of Professionalism: A Sociological Analysis*. Berkeley, The University of California Press.

Littig, B. (2009). *Interviewing the Elite - Interviewing Experts: Is There a Difference?* In *Interviewing Experts*. A. Bogner, B. Littig and W. Menz. Basingstoke & New York, Palgrave Mancmillian**:** p. 98 - 113.

Lum, G. (1999). Where's the Competence in Competence-based Education and Training? *Journal of Philosophy of Education* **33**(3).

Lunt, I. (2008). *Ethical issues in professional life*. In *Exploring Professionalism*. B. Cunningham. London, Institute of Education, University of London**:** 73-98.

Lunt, N., McKenzie, P. and Powell, L. (1993). 'The Right Track'. Teacher Training and the New Right:change and review. *Educational Studies* **19**(2): 143-161.

Lynne, V. (2013). "*How to Use Toulmin Analysis with Examples*." Available at: http://hubpages.com/hub/How-to-Use-a-Toulmin-Argument-Model-for-Reading-and-Writing (Accessed: 15th February 2016).

MacDonald, K. (1985). Social closure and occupational registration. *Sociology* **19**(4): 541-556.

MacDonald, S. (2013). Manufacturing Teachers – A Critical Reading of the Teacher in 'Teaching Scotland's Future'. *eSharp* (20 (Spring 2013): New Horizons).

Mahony, P. and Hextall, I. (2000). *Reconstructing Teaching, Standards, Performance and Accountability*. London, RoutledgeFalmer.

Marland, M. (1993). *The Craft of the Classroom, A Survival Guide to Classroom Management in the Secondary School*. Oxford, Heinemann Education.

Martimianakis, M. A., Maniate, J. M. and Hodges, B. D. (2009). Sociological Interpretations of Professionalsim. *Medical Education* **43**: 829-837.

Martin, S. and Cloke, C. (2000). Standards for the Award of Qualified Teacher Status: reflections on assessment implications. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* **25**(2): 183-190.

Mays, N. and Pope, C. (2000). Assessing quality in qualitative research. *British Medical Journal* **320**(7226): 50-52.

McAninch, A. C. (2003). *What should teachers be accountable for? A conceptual analysis*. *American Educational Research Association*. Chicago**:** April 21-25 2003.

McCrone, G. (2000). *A teaching profession for the twenty first century*. Edinburgh, SEED.

McLaughlin, T. H. (1999). Beyond the Reflective Teacher. *Educational Philosophy and Theory* **31**(1).

Menter, I., Brisard, E. and Smith, I. (2006). Making Teachers in Britain: Professional knowledge for initial teacher education in England and Scotland. *Educational Philosophy and Theory* **38**(3): 269 - 286.

Menter, I. and Hulme, M. (2008). Is small beautiful? Policy-making in teacher education in Scotland. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice* **14**(4): 319 - 330.

Menter, I. and Hulme, M. (2011). Teacher education reform in Scotland: national and global influences. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International research and pedagogy* **37**(4): 387-397.

Menter, I., Hulme, M., Elliot, D. and Lewin, J. (2010). *Literature Review on Teacher Education in the 21st Century*. Edinburgh, The Scottish Government Social Research.

Menter, I., Mahony, P. and Hextall, I. (2004). Ne'er the twain shall meet?: modernizing the teaching profession in Scotland and England. *Journal of Education Policy* **19**(2): 195-214.

Nolan, M. (1995). *First Report of the Committee on Standards in Public Life*. London, HMSO.

Nunn, J. (2008). *From the interface of policy and practice: revising the standards for qualified teacher status in England. A traveller's tale.* Doctorate in Education, School of Education, Roehamption University.

Nunn, J. (2012). *Implementing the revised Teacher's Standards in Initial Teacher Education, Support materials*. London, UCET.

NUT (2011). *Review of Teaching Standards*. London, National Union of Teachers.

NUT (2012). *Teachers' Standards (England) - NUT Guidance*. London, National Union of Teachers.

O'Brien, J. (2012). Teacher education in Scotland: the Donaldson Review and the early phases of teacher learning. *Research in Teacher Education* **2**(2): 42-47.

O'Hear, A. (1988). *Who Teaches the Teachers? A contribution to public debate of the DES Green Paper*. London, The Social Affairs Unit. 10.

O'Meara, J. and MacDonald, D. (2004). Power, prestige and pedagogic identity: a tale of two programs recontextualizing teacher standards. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education* **32**(2): 111-127.

O'Reilly, D. and Reed, M. (2010). 'Leaderism': An Evolution of Managerialism in UK Public Service Reform. *Public Administration* **88**(4): 960-978.

O'Reilly, D. and Reed, M. (2011). The Grit in the Oyster: Professionalism, Managerialism and Leaderism as Discourses of UK Public Services Modernization. *Organisational Studies* **32**(8): 1079-1101.

Odendahl, T. and Shaw, A., Eds. (2002). *Handbook of Interview Research, Context and Method*. International Education and Professional Publisher. Thousand Oaks, London & New Delhi, SAGE Publications.

OECD (2007a). *Improving the Quality of Teacher Education*. Paris, OECD.

OECD (2007b). *Reviews of National Policies for Education - Quality and Equity of Schooling in Scotland*. Paris, OECD.

OECD (2011). *Building a High-Quality Teaching Profession, Lessons from Around the World*. *Background Report for the International Summit on the Teaching profession*. Paris, OECD.

OECD (2015). *Improving Schools in Scotland: An OECD Perspective*. Paris, OECD.

Ozga, J. (2005a). Modernizing the education workforce: a perspective from Scotland. *Educational Review* **57**(2): 207-219.

Ozga, J. (2005b). *Travelling and Embedded Policy: the case of post Devolution Scotland within the UK*. In *World Yearbook of Education 2005: Globalisation and Nationalism in Education*. D. Coulby and E. Zambeta. Abingdon, RoutledgeFalmer.

Ozga, J. and Jones, R. (2006). Travelling and embedded policy: the case of knowledge transfer. *Journal of Education Policy* **21**(1).

Ozga, J. and Lingard, B. (2007). *Globalisation, Education Policy and Politics*. In *The RoutledgeFalmer Reader in Education Policy and Politics*. B. Lingard and J. Ozga, Routledge. Abingdon.

Phillips, D. (2015). *Policy Borrowing in Education: Frameworks for Analysis*. In *Second International Handbook on Globalisation, Education and Policy Research*. J. Zajda. Netherlands, Springer.

Polanyi, M. (1958). *Personal knowledge, towards a post-critical philosophy*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.

Polanyi, M. (1967). *The Tacit Dimension*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Popkewitz, T., Lindblad, S. and Strandberg, J. (1999). *Review of research on education governance and social integration and exclusion*. *Uppsala Reports on Education 35*. Uppsala, Universitetstryckeriet.

Power, M. (1997). *The Audit Society: Rituals of Verification*. Oxford, University Press.

QAAHE (2000). *Benchmark Information: standard for initial teacher education in Scotland*. Gloucester, Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education.

Raffe, D., Brannen, K., Linda, Croxford and Martin, C. (1999). Comparing England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland: the case for `home internationals' in comparative research. *Comparative Education* **35**(1): 9-25.

Raffe, D. and Byrne, D. (2005). *Policy Learning From 'Home International' Comparisons*. Edinburgh, Centre for Educational Sociology, University of Edinburgh.

Ragin, C. (1987). *The Comparative Method, moving beyond qualitative and quantitative strategies*. London, Univeristy of California Press.

Rapoport, A. (2015). *Challenges and Opportunities: Resocialization as a Framework for Global Citizenship*. In *Globalisation, Ideology and Politics of Education Reforms*. J. Zajda. Switzerland, Springer.

Robertson, I. (2008). "*An Introduction to Basil Bernstein*." Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=p9fVj73oKDk (Accessed: 15th February 2016).

Robertson, S. (1996). *Teachers' Work, Restructuring and Postfordism: Constructing the New 'Professionalism'*. In *Teachers' Professional Lives*. I. Goodson and A. Hargreaves. London, Falmer Press.

Robinson, G. (2010). *Knowing Why and Daring to be Different: Becoming and Being Teachers-as-Learners*. Doctor of Education, University of Edinburgh.

Ryle, G. (1949). *The Concept of Mind*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Sachs, J. (2001). Teacher professional identity: competing discourse, competing outcomes. *Journal of Education Policy* **16**(2): 149-161.

Sachs, J. (2003a). *The Activist Teaching Profession*. Buckingham, Open University Press.

Sachs, J. (2003b). Teacher Professional Standards: Controlling or developing teaching? *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice* **9**(2): 175-186.

Sachs, J. (2005). *Professional standards: quality teachers for the future*. *Sharing Experience: ways forward on standards conference*. Hilton Hotel, Melbourne, NIQTSL.

Schön, D. (1983). *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. 2009 Ed. Farnham, Ashgate.

Schön, D. (1987). *Educating the Reflective Practitioner, Towards a New Design for Teaching and Learning in the Professions*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Scottish Executive (2002). *The Standard for Chartered Teacher*. Edinburgh, Scottish Executive.

Scottish Executive (2004). *A Curriculum for Excellence*. Edinburgh, The Scottish Executive.

Scottish Government (2011). *Continuing to build excellence in teaching, The Scottish Government's response to Teaching Scotland's Future*. Edinburgh, Scottish Government.

Scottish Government (2012a). *Learning for Sustainability, The report of the One Planet Schools Working Group*. Edinburgh, Scottish Government.

Scottish Government (2012b). *Teaching Scotland's Future - National Partnership Group, Report to Cabinet Secretart for Education and Lifelong Learning*. Edinburgh, Scottish Government.

Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and Teaching: Foundations of the New Reform. *Harvard Educational Review* **57**(1): 1-22.

Singh, P. (2002). Pedagogising Knowledge: Bernstein's theory of the pedagogoc device. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* **23**(4): 571 - 582.

Singh, P., Thomas, S. and Harris, J. (2013). Recontextualising policy discourses: a Bernsteinian perspective on policy interpretation, translation, enactment. *Journal of Education Policy* **28**(4): 465 - 480.

Smith, R. (2005). *Paths of Judgement, The revival of practical wisdom*. In *The RoutledgeFalmer Reader in Philosopy of Education*. W. Carr. London, RoutledgeFalmer.

SNP (2011). *Scottish National Party Manifesto 2011*. Edinburgh, SNP.

Stewart, W. (2010). "*A decade on, academic who led AFL movement admits it 'isn't happening' in many classrooms*." Available at: http://www.tes.co.uk/article.aspx?storycode=6062338 (Accessed: 15th February 2016).

Storey, A. (2007). Cultural shifts in teaching: new workforce, new professionalism? *Curriculum Journal* **18**(3): 253 - 270.

Strike, K. (2007). *Is Teaching a Profession: How Would We Know?* In *Philosophy of Education, An Anthology*. R. Curren. Malden, Blackwell Publishing**:** 175-187.

Stronach, I., Corbin, B., McNamara, O., Stark, S. and Warne, T. (2002). Towards an uncertain politics of professionalism: teacher and nurse identities in flux. *Journal of Education Policy* **17**(1): 109-138.

Sykes, G. and Plastrik, P. (1993). *Standards setting as educational reform: trends and issues paper No. 8*. Washington D.C., National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

Tan, C. (2010). Contesting reform: Bernstein's pedagogic device and madrasah education in Singapore. *Journal of Curriculum Studies* **42**(2): 165-182.

Taylor, S. (2004). Researching educational policy and chamge in 'new times': using critical discourse analysis. *Journal of Education Policy* **19**(4): 433-451.

TDA (2007). *Professional Standards for Teachers, Why sit still in your career?* London, Training and Development Agency for Schools.

TDA (2008). *Professional Standards for Teachers: Guidance on the Craft of Teaching*. London, Training and Development Agency for Schools.

Titscher, S., Meyer, M., Wodak, R. and Vetter, E. (2000). *Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis*. London, Sage.

Tong, A., Sainsbury, P. and Craig, J. (2007). Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal of Quality in Health Care* **19**(6): 349-357.

Toulmin, S. (1988). *The uses of Argument*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

TTA (1997a). *Qualifying to Teach, the Professional Standards for Qualified Teacher Status and requirements for Initial Teacher Training*. London, Teacher Training Agency.

TTA (1997b). *Training Curriculum and Standards for New Teachers, Revised Requirements for all Courses of Initial Teacher Training*. London, Teacher Training Agency.

UCET (2011). *Review of teaching standards - letter to the Secretary of State for Education*. London, Universities' Council for the Education of Teachers.

UNICEF. (2009). "*The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child* " Available at: http://www.unicef.org.uk/Documents/Publication-pdfs/UNCRC_PRESS200910web.pdf (Accessed: 16 February 2016).

van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology, A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London, SAGE Publications Ltd.

van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and Power*. Paulgrave MacMillan.

van Leeuwen, T. (2007). Legitimation in discourse and communication. *Discourse and Communication* **1**(1): 91-112.

van Leeuwen, T. and Wodak, R. (1999). Legitimizing immigration control: a discourse-historical analysis. *Discourse Studies* **1**(1): 83-118.

Vellani, F. (2013). *Understanding Disability Discrimination Law through Geography*. Farnham, Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Watson, C. and Fox, A. (2015). Professional re-accreditation: constructing educational policy for career-long teacher professional learning. *Journal of Education Policy* **30**(1).

Whitty, G. (1992). Quality Control in Teacher Education. *British Journal of Educational Studies* **40**(1).

Whitty, G. (2000). Teacher professionalsim in new times. *Journal of In-service Education* **26**(2): 281-295.

Widdowson, H. G. (1995). Discouse analysis: a critical view. *Language and Literature* **4**(3): 157-172.

Widdowson, H. G. (2004). *Text, content, pretext*. Oxford, Blackwell.

Williams, R. (2010). 'New minister Nick Gibb upsets teachers – already', *The Guardian*, Monday 17th May 2010. (Accessed 15th February 2016).

Williamson, Z. and Robinson, G. (2009). 'Challenge', 'freedom', 'change': an emerging language of activism from Chartered Teachers? *Professional Development in Education* **35**(1): 43-61.

Winch, C. (2004). What do teachers need to know about teaching? A critical examination of the occupational knowledge of teachers. *British Journal of Educational Studies* **52**(2): 180 - 196.

Winch, C. (2012). For philosophy of education in teacher education. *Oxford Review of Education* **38**(3): 305-322.

Woodside-Jiron, H. (2011). *Language, Power, and participation: Using Critical Discourse Analysis to Make Sense of Public Policy*. In *An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education*. R. Roger. Hoboken, Taylor and Francis.

WWF (2006). *One Planet Living: an agenda for Scotland*. Dunkeld, Perthshire, World Wide Fund for Nature.

WWF (2010). *A Manifesto for 2011: time for a one planet Scotland*. Dunkeld, World Widelife Fund for Nature.

Zajda, J. (2015). *Globalisation, Ideology and Education Reform*. In *Globalisation, Ideolgy and Politics of Education Reforms*. J. Zajda. Switzerland, Springer.

Appendix 1: Interview Schedule for English Interviews

Introduction

The interview will cover four main topics (list topic) and will be recorded using a digital recorder and, for backup, a tablet computer. The interview will be transcribed by myself and returned to you in order for you to check the content.

Number	Question	Prompts, probes and follow up questions
	1. Background and Teachers' Standards Review Group membership	
1a.	Please could you start by describing your background and experience within education?	How long have you been a teacher/in current role? Have you worked for a number of institutions?
1b.	How did you become a member of the Teachers' Standards Review Group?	How were you identified as someone who can contribute to this review and how were you approached to serve on the group'?
1c.	How did you approach your participation on the group?	Did you consider yourself as representing the institution you work for or did you approach the review in a personal capacity?
1d.	To what extent do you believe that the review group was representative of teachers and other educational stakeholders?	Was there geographical/primary/secondary/type of school representation? Why do you think certain teacher/educational organisations were excluded from the group (GTC(E), teacher/head teacher unions, universities, local authorities etc.)?

2. The Review Group process

2a.	Could you tell me a bit about the review process itself and how it was conducted and your role within it?	What was the role of the Drafting Group and how did this synchronise with the Review Group? Did you discuss the standards with the stakeholders in your sector? What about the Master Standard – how was this considered?
2b.	To what extent do you think the review process stuck to aims of the Review process as set out by the Terms of Reference?	Might need to remind the participant about the Government's aims for the review. Why was it necessary to remove the layers of standards for career progression? Why was it considered necessary to have accompanying bullet points?
2c.	How were the previous set of standards and GTC(E) code of conduct considered as part of the review and drafting process?	Were there any discussions on whether it was possible to integrate a code of conduct within the Teachers' Standards?
2d.	How much of the Review Groups time was concerned with using sets of standards from other countries or from other occupational groups?	Which country's standards with considered? Which standards from other occupational groups were considered? Was any account taken of how the standards work in Scotland?
2e.	Were there any discussions about the nature of teachers' professional knowledge?	What about the use of systematic synthetic phonics? How was subject knowledge defined?

3. Interpretation of the Teachers' Standards

3a.	Who do you think the Teachers' Standards are written for?	Is the assessor/head teacher role seen as more important than the need to promote teacher professionalism/development? What is the significance of the title 'Teachers' Standards'? Is there a reason why they are not called 'professional standards'?
3b.	To what extent do you think the Teachers' Standards enhance the professional standing of teachers?	In what ways do they enhance teachers' professionalism? How would you characterise this form of professionalism?
3c.	Do you have any further thoughts on how to improve the Teachers' Standards or any future sets of standards?	What improvements are they?

Appendix 2: Interview Schedule for Scottish Interviews

Introduction

The interview will cover four main topics (list topic) and will be recorded using a digital recorder and, for backup, a tablet computer. The interview will be transcribed by myself and returned to you in order for you to check the content.

Number	Question	Prompts, probes and follow up questions
	4. Background and Professional Standards group membership	
1a.	Please could you start by describing your background and experience within education?	How long have you been a teacher/in current role? Have you worked for a number of institutions?
1b.	What influence do you think the Donaldson review has had on teaching in Scotland?	What was the catalyst for the Donaldson review? What was the GTCS's role in the review? Why was the drafting of all levels of standards entrusted to the GTCS?
1c.	How did you become a member of the revision of the Professional Standards Steering Group and/or Writing Group(s)?	How were you identified as someone who can contribute to this review and how were you approached to serve on the group(s)?
1d.	How did you approach your participation on the group?	Did you consider yourself as representing the institution you work for or did you approach the review in a personal capacity?
1e.	To what extent do you believe that the review group was representative of teachers and other educational stakeholders in Scotland?	Were you familiar with the other members of the group? Had you met them/ worked with before? Was there a large amount of agreement or a 'collective narrative' amongst group members?

5. The Review Group process

2a.	Could you tell me a bit about the review process itself and how it was conducted and your role within it?	How did the steering group and the writing group interact? Did you discuss the standards with the stakeholders in your sector?
2b.	The Donaldson review recommended: 'the professional Standards need to be revised to create a coherent overarching framework and enhanced with practical illustrations of the Standards. This overall framework should reflect a reconceptualised model of teacher professionalism.' To what extent do you think this recommendation was met?	Might need to remind the participant about the Government's aims for the review. Why was it necessary to remove the layers of standards for career progression? Why was it considered necessary to have accompanying bullet points?
2c.	How much of the Review Groups time was concerned with using sets of standards from other countries or from other occupational groups?	Which country's standards with considered? Which standards from other occupational groups were considered? Was any account taken of how the standards work in England?
2d.	Were there any discussions about the nature of teachers' professional knowledge?	There seems to be resistance to the school-based approaches to teacher training prevalent in England – why do you think this is?

6. Interpretation of the Professional Standards

3a.	Who do you think are the audience for the Professional Standards?	Are they seen more as a national framework rather than a tool to be used by school leaderships?
3b.	To what extent do you think the Professional Standards enhance the professional standing of teachers?	In what ways do they enhance teachers' professionalism? How would you characterise this form of professionalism?
3c.	Do you have any further thoughts on how to improve the Professional Standards or any future sets of standards?	What improvements are they? How could the review and writing process be improved?

Appendix 3: Timelines for the review processes in England and Scotland

England	Scotland
6th May 2010 – UK General Election produces no overall majority for one political party. A coalition between the Conservative Party and Liberal Democrat Party is subsequently formed. The UK Government has responsibility for education in England but not in Scotland.	
	February 2010 – start of the Donaldson Review. Donaldson visits all universities engaged in teacher education, commissions a review of literature by Glasgow University and visits a range of schools and local authorities.
24th November 2010 – *The Schools White Paper, The Importance of Teaching* (DfE, 2010b) is released confirming the abolition of the GTC England and announcing the review of the existing teaching standards.	
	January 2011 – *Teaching Scotland's Future* (TSF) (Donaldson, 2011) published and recommends a revision of the existing standards and the development of an overall framework of teaching standards.
11th March 2011 – Launch of the *Independent Review of Teachers' Standards*.	March 2011 – Scottish Government publish their response to TSF broadly welcoming the recommendations and sets up the National Partnership Group.
14th March and 4th July 2011 - the Review Group met on seven occasions between (the group also met between July and November 2011 to consider the Master Standard).	
16 May and 10 June 2011 - the DfE facilitated discussions with a number of key users of teaching standards, teacher and head-teacher unions were also met during this period 'to listen to their comments on the draft standards' (DfE, 2011a).	5th May 2011 – Scottish Parliament elections return the Scottish National Party to majority government in Scotland.
14th July 2011 – release of the *First Report of the Independent Review of Teachers' Standards* (DfE, 2011a).	

England	Scotland
	7th December 2011 – a meeting of the GTC Scotland Council confirms the setting up of the Steering Group together with three Writing Groups to review the professional standards. Winter/Spring 2012 - Steering and Writing Group meetings take place.
1st September 2012 – the *Teachers' Standards* are implemented.	29th August to 6th November 2012 - consultation takes place on the revised *Professional Standards for Teachers* from this included three regional meetings in Aberdeen, Edinburgh and Glasgow. 19 November 2012 - findings from the consultation considered by the Education Committee of the GTC Scotland. 5 December 2012 - approval of revised *Professional Standards for Teachers* at a full meeting of the GTC Scotland Council. 1st August 2013 – revised *Professional Standards for Teachers* implemented.

Appendix 4: The Independent Review of Teachers' Standards, Review Group Members

Review Group membership with positions listed as at the time of the *Independent Review of Teachers' Standards* (DfE 2011a).

The Review Group

Sally Coates (Chair), Principal of Burlington Danes Academy, Hammersmith and Fulham

Roy Blatchford (Deputy Chair), Director of the National Education Trust

Richard Aird, Head-teacher of Barrs Court Special School, Hereford

Joan Deslandes, Head-teacher of Kingsford Community School, Newnham, London

Judith Fenn, Head of School Services at the Independent Schools Council

John McIntosh OBE, Former Head-teacher of the London Oratory School

Dr Dan Moynihan, Chief Executive of Harris Academies

Professor Anthony O'Hear, Professor of Philosophy and former Head of Education Department, Buckingham University

Leanne Simmonds, Subject Leader of Modern Foreign Languages, Evelyn Grace Academy

Patricia Sowter CBE, Principal of Cuckoo Hall Academy

Ava Sturridge-Packer CBE, Head-teacher of St Mary's C of E Primary School, Birmingham

Greg Wallace, Executive Principal of the Best Start Federation, Hackney

Brett Wigdortz, Chief Executive of Teach First

Lizzie Williams, Lead Teacher at King Solomon Academy, London

Patrick Leeson (observer), Director of Development, Education and Care, Ofsted

The Drafting Group

Roy Blatchford (Chair)

Joan Deslandes

John McIntosh OBE

Professor Anthony O'Hear

Leanne Simmonds

Ava Sturridge-Packer CBE

Appendix 5: Revision of the Scottish Professional Standards Steering Group and Writing Groups

Steering and Writing Groups selected to carry out the revision of the *Professional Standards for Teachers* (GTCS, 2014a).

Review of Professional Standards Steering Group

Margaret Alcorn, Education Scotland
Liz Clark, STEC (Scottish Teacher Education Committee)
Sheila Inglis, SMCI Associates
Tom Kirk, ADSW (Association of Directors of Social Work)
Judith McClure, SCEN (Scotland China Educational Network)
Peter McNaughton, Education Scotland
Pamela Nesbitt, AHDS (Association of Headteachers and Deputes in Scotland)
Neil Shaw, SLS (School Leaders Scotland)
Margaret Smith, SSTA (Scottish Secondary Teachers Association)
Rachel Sunderland/David Roy, Scottish Government
Andrew Sutherland, ADES (Association of Directors of Education in Scotland)
Kelley Temple, NUS Scotland (National Union of Students Scotland)
Brendan Tierney, SQA (Scottish Qualifications Authority)
Morag Watson/Betsy King, WWF Scotland (World Wildlife Fund Scotland)
Louise Wilson/Kay Barnett, EIS (Educational Institute of Scotland)

Writing Group 1 – Standards for Registration

Mairi McAra, GTC Scotland
Alan Gall, Teacher
Grant Gillies, Head-teacher
Amanda Corrigan, Strathclyde University
Norrie Mackay, North Lanarkshire Council
Winnie Mallon, Glasgow City Council
Seonaid McGillivray, Head-teacher
Teresa Moran, Dundee University
Marilyn Richards, Orkney Islands Council

Writing Group 2 – Standard for Career-Long Professional Learning

Rosa Murray, GTC Scotland
Sarinder Bhopal, Chartered Teacher
Margery McMahon, Glasgow University
Jackie Morley, Borders Local Authority
David Noble, Chartered Teacher

Vanessa Reynolds, Primary Teacher

Gillian Robinson, Edinburgh University

Zoe Williamson, Edinburgh University

Writing Group 3 – Standards for Leadership and Management

Gillian Hamilton, GTC Scotland

John Daffurn, East Renfrewshire Council

Christine Forde, Glasgow University

Alison Fox, Stirling University

Anne Pearson, Falkirk Council

Dennise Sommerville, Head-teacher

Appendix 6: Examples of the use of CDA in the analysis of text

The extracts below have been selected to demonstrate how the selected units of text were analysed using the method of CDA outlined in section 4.4. The text in red below indicate analytical notes added to the text.

Extract 1: The forward to How the world's best-performing school systems come out on top (McKinsey & Company report) written by Andreas Schleicher (Barber & Mourshed, 2007, p.6)

Narrative genre providing the grand narrative for the main report aimed at the global context.

The capacity of countries - both the world's most advanced economies as well those experiencing rapid development - to compete in the global knowledge economy increasingly depends on whether they can meet a fast-growing demand for high-level skills. This, in turn, hinges on significant improvements in the quality of schooling outcomes and a more equitable distribution in learning opportunities.

Hegemonic function here in so far as 'quality of schooling' linked to 'high-levels skills'. Value assumption: sole purpose of education to meet this 'fast-growing' demand'.

International comparisons, such as the OECD's Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) make it now possible to regularly and directly compare the quality of educational outcomes across education systems. They reveal wide differences in the extent to which countries succeed in fostering knowledge and skills in key subject areas.

Existential assumption: that it is possible to compare educational outcomes across nations with different culture, exam systems etc. 'Key subject areas' assumes that there is an identified list of subjects that do (and do not) to the 'global knowledge economy'.

For some countries, results from PISA have been disappointing, showing that their 15-year-olds' performance lags considerably behind that of other countries, sometimes by the equivalent of several years of schooling and sometimes despite high investments in education. International comparisons have also highlighted significant variation in the performance of schools and raised strong concerns about equity in the distribution of learning opportunities. Last but not least, they suggest that there is significant scope for improving educational efficiency such that, across OECD countries, taxpayers could expect 22% more output for their current investments into schooling.

'Taxpayers' represented as 'movers' (social actors) and are personalised as the group with the main concern or 'investment' in schooling – the ultimate authority. Other social actors are backgrounded (parents, local government, society etc.). There is an identity and certainty with 'PISA' – the unquestioning authority on these matters.

Extract 2: The UK Government's report: *The Case for Change* (DfE, 2010a)

Analysis of data in England (backing) shows much the same: good teachers make a substantial difference to overall attainment and progress (claim), and this can be shown to be likely to have an impact on GCSE grades. Likewise, the DfES VITAE study (government initiated study) shows that in relation to pupil progress, the influence of the teacher was more important than pupils' background characteristics.

'Pupil progress' is pupil attainment in public examinations. Teacher 'activated' in so far as having effect on pupil attainment. Pupils passivated – this is something done unto pupils by the teachers.

So, the evidence is clear that improving average teacher quality has considerable potential for improving educational standards. The key question is therefore what

should be done to improve teacher quality. The evidence suggests that at the national level, three strategies are effective: recruiting more of the most effective people; improving their initial training and induction; and improving the systems for their professional development.

Teacher passivated here as the system activates to 'improve teacher quality'. The commitment of the claim is modified to a possibility 'evidence suggests'. Teachers dehumanised is terms of needing 'more of the most effective people'.

Extract 3: Michael Gove speech *to the National College* ***in 2010 (Gove, 2010)***

Look at the highest performing nations in any measure of educational achievement and

they are always, but always, those with the most highly qualified teachers (claim). Whether its Singapore, South Korea or Finland (backing, Finland quite different to Singapore and South Korea), as Sir Michael Barber has pointed out in his ground-breaking study for McKinsey nothing matters more in education that attracting the best people into teaching (warrant) and making sure that every minute in the classroom is spent with children benefiting from the best possible instruction.

'Instruction' (didactic) used instead of 'teaching' (dialogic) indicates a particular pedagogic mode.

The generation of teachers currently in our schools is the best ever, but given the pace

of international improvement we must always be striving to do better. That is why we will expand organisations such as Teach First, Teaching Leaders and Future Leaders which have done so much to attract more highly talented people into education.

Identifies with the (global) arguments presented by OECD and McKinsey. Use of 'we' (the Government) personally identifies them with that argument.

That is why we will write off the student loan payments of science and maths graduates who go into teaching.

That is why we will reform teacher recruitment to ensure there is a relentless focus on tempting the best into this, most rewarding, of careers.

And that is why we will reform teacher training to shift trainee teachers out of college and into the classroom.

In representing this (recontextualised) argument, a significant addition is made in terms of shifting 'trainee teachers out of college'. This additional element was not in the McKinsey report.

We will end the arbitrary bureaucratic rule which limits how many teachers can be trained in schools, shift resources so that more heads can train teachers in their own schools, and make it easier for people to shift in mid-career into teaching.

Teachers passivated here and 'heads' activated.

Teaching is a craft and it is best learnt as an apprentice observing a master craftsman or woman. Watching others, and being rigorously observed yourself as you develop, is the best route to acquiring mastery in the classroom. Which is why I also intend to abolish those rules which limit the ability of school leaders to observe teachers at work. Nothing should get in the way of making sure we have the best possible cadre of professionals ready to inspire the next generation.

There is a certainty in identifying teaching with craft knowledge. There is a recontextualisation of the 'connoisseurship' of Polanyi as it deletes other forms of transferring this form of knowledge (discussions, mentoring etc.). Leaderism (activation of school leadership) promoted above passivated teachers. Teachers unions have fought to limit the number of times a teacher can be observed.

Extract 4: the forward to *The First Report of the Independent Review of Teachers' Standards* (DfE, 2011a)

This document is associated with Dame Sally Coates whose name, picture and forward appears at the start of the document.

The conclusion of Sir Michael Barber's seminal study of the world's best performing school systems has fast become a guiding principle for developing education policy: "the quality of an education system cannot exceed the quality of its teachers".

High degree of intertextuality through the direct quotation of Michael Barber's report who is personalised.

A relentless focus on high-quality teachers and teaching requires a clear and universal understanding of the basic elements of good teaching. The standards which define our expectations for teachers' professional practice should therefore set the benchmark for excellent teaching and exemplary personal conduct. They should set a standard to which all trainees aspire, and which all qualified teachers adhere to and improve upon throughout the various stages of their career.

There is an element of disembedding happening here – movement of a narrative genre to what should be a report of a review process ('relentless focus on high-quality teachers').

Earlier this year the Secretary of State asked me to conduct a review of the existing standards for teachers, with a view to establishing new standards that are clearly expressed and that can be used effectively to underpin teacher training, support performance management and guide teachers' ongoing professional development. Ultimately, the standards which define teachers' professional practice and personal conduct should contribute to raising public confidence in the teaching profession.

Genre of governance – the Terms of Reference by the Secretary of State regulating the Independent Review of Teachers' Standards.

Extract 5: part of an interview transcription

And how do you think that you were seen as someone who could contribute towards the review?

I have been a successful head-teacher – my leadership has been rated, on a number of occasions, as outstanding. I have had very good links with the independent sector and used the knowledge I have gained from that sector to inform the strategic organisation and actions that I have implemented within my school. And pupils in my school make better and significant progress despite the fact that over two thirds of them are eligible for the pupil premium.

Identification of success with the individual (much use of I). Leadership 'rated as outstanding' – a sense of mediated expertise.

And how did you approach your participation on the group?

I read up on the current standards, I listened to the views of others, I considered from the point of view of as a head-teacher wanting to have positive impacts on pupils' outcomes and as a teacher meeting the demands of a head-teacher with very high expectations. What would be most appropriate in terms of teaching standards? And then, central in all of that, is the experience of pupils in the classroom and the experience of pupils in their daily school life.

The pupils and the head-teacher are activated – the teachers are passivated and backgrounded. Identity adopted in the Review was one of a 'demanding head-teacher'.

Could you tell me about the review process itself and how it was conducted and your role within it?

J: Okay, we did have the advice and support of DfE officials. We had a team of people coming from different backgrounds (claim), from higher education, teaching, teacher development, primary and secondary schools (backing). And, in terms of approach, we discussed what were the key challenges for ensuring that pupils had a good experience in terms of learning, teaching and progress and what did that therefore been for teaching standards. And what were the barriers to achieving what was want for good and better progress and achievement, learning and teaching, and how could these be catered for within the standards.

DfE officials as social actors are activated and personalised with a distinct governance role. Implicit warrant is that people for different backgrounds are required for such a role. Assumption is that this does represent the full range of backgrounds available from across the sector.